The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLII APRIL 1956 NUMBER 2

BURKE'S *PRESENT DISCONTENTS:* THE RHETORICAL GENESIS OF A PARTY TESTAMENT

Donald C. Bryant

Of three great political crises which threatened the system of George III; the first in 1769-70 arose out of the Middlesex election case, and the attempt to generalize the grievance of a single county by carrying the issue to all bodies of freeholders throughout the land.[1]

WHEN Edmund Burke undertook to add one more to the spate of opposition pamphlets constituting one phase of the dual attack on the Court system in the summer and autumn of 1769, his modest purpose was to define the position of the Marquis of Rockingham and that group of Whigs of whom he was the leader, in the fluid and shifting context of opposition politics. At the time, Burke had sat in parliament less than four years, and for only a few months longer had he been associated with those successors of the "Old Duke" of Newcastle and the Duke of Devonshire who were joined under the leadership of the young Marquis.[2] Though Burke was neither the official leader of the Rockingham connection in the House of Commons nor its most influential member,[3] he was perhaps closest to Rockingham and was the prime source of the energy and activity surrounding the leader. Opponents as well as friends recognized him as the Marquis's right hand, perhaps "both his hands."[4] Already his party's most formidable speaker, the "readiest man upon all points perhaps in the whole House,"[5] with the composition of *Thoughts on*

Donald C. Bryant (Ph.D., Cornell, 1937), Professor of Speech and English at Washington University, St. Louis, is Editor-Elect of the QJS.

[1] H. Butterfield, *George III, Lord North, and the People, 1779-80* (London, 1949), p. 184.

[2] Burke had become private secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham in July, 1765, and had been elected to the House of Commons in December of that year.

[3] William Dowdeswell, Burke's close associate in the management of party affairs, had been "leader" of the party in the House since 1765, and retained that position until his death in 1775. The most influential individual member of the Rockingham connection in the lower house was probably Sir George Savile, member for Yorkshire, and generally recognized as the most honorable of this set of honorable and incorruptible men.

[4] Buckinghamshire to Grenville, June, 1766, quoted by D. A. Winstanley (*Personal and Party Government . . . , 1760-1766*, Cambridge, 1910, p. 243) from *Add. MSS*, 22858 f. 35.

[5] *Correspondence of William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (London, 1839), III, 110.

the Cause of Present Discontents he became without question its foremost publicist as well.

The *Present Discontents* stands among the four or five greatest politico-rhetorical pamphlets of a great age of political pamphlets. One might safely include in the comparison, for example, such periodical performances as the *Letters of Junius* and Swift's *Drapier's Letters*. In function and mode of development it is perhaps most closely akin to Swift's *Conduct of the Allies*. Each professed to review the growth of an intolerable situation and to discredit the reigning system responsible for that situation so that reformation might set in. In style less imaginative than Burke's own *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, of twenty years later, and in eloquence less passionate, the *Discontents* is comparable to its blood brother in principle of organization and development, and very much like it in genesis and mode of composition.

This pamphlet, which occupies 102 pages in a standard edition of his *Works*,[6] was Burke's third acknowledged publication in defense of the principles and position of his party. His first effort had been a three-page trifle called *A Short Account of a Late Short Administration*,[7] published in 1766, a few weeks after Rockingham had succumbed to circumstances, the Court, and the Earl of Chatham. Burke tells the Court, in effect: "You needn't be proud of yourselves for throwing us out. We were virtuous: we repealed the Stamp Act and otherwise improved the state of the nation; our successors should have joined us; the country will be sorry." The second pamphlet,[8] published only a few months before Burke began the *Present Discontents*, was a reply to a pamphlet, probably by George Grenville, in which the architect of the Stamp Act and the first Wilkes case blamed his successors, including the Rockinghams, for the deplorable financial condition of the country and for the continuation of the American problem. Burke's refutation of Grenville, both political and fiscal, though firm and elaborate, was somewhat lacking in the enlargement of political view and in the grasp of principle and the broad application of generalization which was to raise the *Present Discontents* from a party pamphlet into a credo for enlightened conservatives.

Historians have usually praised the *Present Discontents*;[9] contemporaries lauded or vilified it, depending on their political connections. Catherine Macaulay, for example, the famous republican, acknowledged its worth by snarling its damnation.[10] No one ignored it. To students of politics it is known today, perhaps, for its exposure of the system of "double cabinet," which George III, the Earl of Bute, and their friends had developed for the control of parliament. Or perhaps one recalls Burke's defense of the people against the charge of viciousness:

> I am not one of those who think that the people are never in the wrong. . . . But I do say, that in all disputes between them and their rulers, the presumption is at least upon a par in favor of the people. . . . The people have no interest in disorder. When they do wrong, it is their error, and not their crime. But with the governing part of the state, it is far otherwise. They certainly may act ill by design, as well as by mistake.[11]

[6] (Boston, 1894), I, 435-537. Cited below as *Works*.

[7] *Ibid.*, I, 264-268.

[8] *Observations on a Late Publication, Intituled, 'The Present State of the Nation,' Ibid.*, I, 271-432.

[9] E.g., W. E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1891), III, 217-218.

[10] *Observations on . . . Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents* (1770), quoted by G. H. Guttridge, *English Whiggism and the American Revolution* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1942), pp. 44-45.

[11] *Works*, I, 440-441.

But most frequently this pamphlet is known for its classic justification of party as the basis for effective political action:

> Party is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed. . . . It is surely no very rational account of a man's life, that he has always acted right; but has taken special care, to act in such a manner that his endeavors could not possibly be productive of any consequence. . . . It is the business of the politician, who is the philosopher in action, to find out proper means towards . . . [the proper] ends, and to employ them with effect.[12]

I shall not undertake a re-examination of the political philosophy of this pamphlet nor yet an extended rhetorical analysis. The one has been done often and well; the other should perhaps be thought of as subsequent or corollary to my present purpose. In the following pages I propose (1) to trace the rhetorical and operational problems which Burke encountered as he undertook to come to terms with the shifting political situation and with the opinions of his political colleagues in such a way as best to advance the inchoate purposes of his party; and (2) to observe the evidence of Burke's creative processes at work, his habits and methods of composition, upon which I have previously hazarded some preliminary statements.[13] With these ends in mind, therefore, let us follow the pamphlet from its almost casual conception in the summer of 1769, through its long, hazardous gestation during the fall and winter, observing the influences which modified its disposition and features, and concluding with the long-delayed parturition which brought it to birth on 23 April, 1770.

The *Present Discontents* was generated of hope and despair, of haste and delay, of political idealism and practical cynicism, of patriotism and partisanship. Rhetorically Burke strove simultaneously (1) to expose the Court party and its political system as so far out of harmony with the precedent and the spirit of British constitutional freedom that no honest patriot could continue to support it, and (2) to create an image of the Rockingham Whigs so admirable that government by men of their standing and constitutional principles should seem the obvious and happy alternative.

Burke sought first of all, therefore, to reach the public outside parliament, the urban and rural freeholders, the country gentlemen, and the county members at home among their constituents for the parliamentary recess. He wished also strongly to affect his own party. He was keenly aware of the confused and divisive circumstances in the midst of which the party must find renewed unity and must join in effective activity. He wished to help his colleagues, not the least Rockingham himself, discover afresh the motives for that unity and action and a firm foundation for both. He would equip them with a ready armory of principles and arguments for defense and attack. His noble leaders and their friends, busy with their horses and their hounds and their county affairs, must learn clearly to distinguish themselves from the Court party, a lesson which should be fairly easy; but even more carefully must they mark and maintain the distinction between themselves and their competitors in opposition, whom they seemed, to the naked eye, strikingly to resemble in all but name and personal allegiance: the Chatham-Shelburne group with the Grenvillites, on the one hand, and the popular reformers of the City, the Wilkesites, on the other.

[12] *Ibid.*, I, 530, 526-527.

[13] "Edmund Burke: New Evidence, Broader View," *QJS*, XXXVIII (1952), 441-445.

These problems Burke had been meditating for a long time. Two events in the spring of 1769 had tended, however, to bring matters to a crisis and to make Burke feel that he and his party had to speak out firmly and finally before parliament should reassemble in the winter. The Court party had at last, perhaps, overreached itself by its flagrant attack on the franchise in the Middlesex election and had thus apparently weakened itself precariously; and the Earl of Chatham, the most popular statesman of the age, had emerged from his retirement at Hayes and had returned to politics with destruction in his heart for the treasonable ministry, and equally terrifying affection in his voice for the Marquis of Rockingham and his incorruptible associates.[14]

A brief review of the state of affairs when parliament adjourned in the spring of 1769 may help to bring into fresh focus the two factors which I have just mentioned. The administration formed by the Earl of Chatham under the nominal leadership of the Duke of Grafton, which had replaced the Rockinghams in the summer of 1766, had begun to disintegrate, or at least to change its color, almost as soon as it was formed. At once Chatham had taken to the country in one of his long fits of gout, disgruntlement, and nervous derangement. Thus he had cut adrift a government which could have kept a steady course only if he had been present to dominate it at all times. Shortly the chief figure in the quarreling administration had become Charles Townshend, the erratic Chancellor of the Exchequer (he of the famous Townshend Duties imposed upon America), who, among his other exploits, had received the first defeat that a government had suffered on a money bill since the Revolution. The Court party dominated the government on the level of secondary administration, and the opposition, consisting of not only the Rockinghams, but Grenville, and soon most of Chatham's abandoned followers such as Shelburne, Conway, and Colonel Barré, drove the administration to one desperate measure after another.

If the government was divided, however, the opposition was rent by as deep-seated hostilities; so something like a stalemate developed in which sound, moderate measures seemed out of the question.

When Townshend had died suddenly in late 1767, Lord North had begun his ascent, but government majorities had continued to shrink and the most desperate measures were yet to come. John Wilkes, whose talent for rallying the democratic, radical elements, especially in the City of London, was well known and dreaded, returned from exile and with the aid of parts of the opposition, especially Chatham's friends, got himself elected to the House of Commons for the County of Middlesex. Even before he took his seat, however, he had committed what George III and his friends considered several new offenses including what was declared a seditious libel on the Secretary at War. At first the more timorous of George's ministers, including the nominal prime minister, Grafton, had shied away from becoming embroiled with Wilkes again. Before long, however, Lord North had hesitantly accepted the assignment, and the expulsion of Wilkes for seditious

[14] See Burke's bitter remarks about Chatham in his letter to Rockingham, 9 July 1769, reporting Chatham's audience with the king: "It is not yet known whether he was sent for, or went of his own mere notion. . . . If he was not sent for, it was only humbly to lay a reprimand at the feet of his most gracious master, and to talk some significant, pompous, creeping, explanatory, ambiguous matter, in true Chathamic style, and that's all." *Correspondence of . . . Edmund Burke* (London, 1844), I, 173. Cited below as *Correspondence*.

libel had been carried through the House of Commons. As soon as a new election could be held, Wilkes had been returned a second time and as promptly expelled again, over the strenuous opposition of the Rockinghams, the Grenvilles, and the Chatham-Shelburne connection, most of whom professed dislike of Wilkes, but great love for the constitution and the right of franchise. This second expulsion had been accompanied by a declaration of Wilkes' disqualification to sit in that parliament. Nevertheless Wilkes had been immediately re-elected by a large majority over the Court candidate, Colonel Luttrell, who had been persuaded to run against him. Now the House of Commons had declared Luttrell elected, asserting that votes for Wilkes were void because he was disqualified. On this note parliament had adjourned in the spring of 1769, with a confident feeling abroad among the opposition that the government could not long stand against a country which surely would be aroused in defense of its franchise. Coalition seemed all that would be necessary. The "Three Brothers" (Chatham, Grenville, and Temple) were alleged to be on friendly terms again, and Chatham had begun to woo the Rockinghams.

Chatham saw, and Burke and his friends saw, a unified opposition presenting the king with no alternative but an administration composed of themselves alone, without the perennial residue of the Butite *King's Friends*. But Burke saw also, as he heard the affectionate tones of Chatham, an administration which might, perhaps, have Rockingham as its nominal head, but would be directed by Chatham or the Grenvilles on their terms. Of that no good could come, Burke was sure, but some of his colleagues were inclined to compromise and make friends.

In administration or out of administration, however, it was plain that on various measures all branches of the opposition must necessarily act together. The country and the party, therefore, must understand without any question on whose terms and on whose principles the Rockinghams would be found voting and speaking on the same side as the "Three Brothers" and the City Radicals. Though there was a sense of opportunity, however, there was as yet no plan.[15]

With these complex rhetorical problems pressing upon him, perhaps only partly realized, Burke plunged into the activities of the summer. The friends of the constitution—that is, all branches of the opposition—soon launched the campaign on two fronts at once. From the press issued their pamphlets exposing the subversive action on the Middlesex election, and from the hurriedly organized activities in the county meetings came their petitions that the king dissolve the treasonable Parliament. Deeply involved in both phases of the activities, Burke had hardly a moment's leisure for the next six months to attend to his own personal affairs, which had come to a dangerous crisis because

[15] "We have all broke up without any plan of action for the Summer. Dispositions are favourable to a more formed & systematick opposition than has been yet, but as yet they are only dispositions. You probably hear that there is a perfect coalition between us & Grenville; but there is nothing more than good humour towards one another, & a determination to act with Joint Forces against this New, usurped, & most dangerous power of the house of Commons, in electing their own Members." Burke to Charles O'Hara, 31 May 1769. I quote from the Burke-O'Hara manuscripts with the permission of Professor Ross Hoffman whose edition of the letters (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956) was published after this article was already in page proof. The Fitzwilliam manuscripts at the Sheffield City Library and the Dowdeswell letters at the William L. Clements Library have also been very useful, as indicated in the succeeding notes.

of the fall of the East India stock.[16] As early as May 17 he is being urged by Rockingham to come to a meeting at the Marquis's house in London to discuss the manuscript of a pamphlet by Sir William Meredith on the legality of the seating of Luttrell.[17] Meredith, one of the independent members attached to the party, had undertaken to answer Blackstone's defense of the action.

In the midst of constant, voluminous correspondence intended to spur his noble leaders and colleagues to prosecuting their campaigns in the county meetings, Burke himself began to think that he ought to contribute to the pamphlet attack in such a way as to keep the Rockinghams together as a corps in the general campaign. Thus he began to look over his accumulated papers of the preceding nine years. From them he had the feeling that he could put together quickly something which could be published before the convening of parliament and would have the desirable effects upon the course of impending events. He hoped to discover

> What reenforcement might be gained from hope,
> If not what resolution from despair.

We hear first of Burke's intention himself to write a pamphlet, in a letter from Rockingham, 29 June 1769, in which the Marquis said: "Let me beg of you to continue to try to divert your thoughts; I am exceeding glad you have begun to look over the Papers of the System of the last 9 years—that indeed would be at this Time a most Useful Work & would do more good in giving right Ideas to the Publick—than all the proceedings have done hitherto of late."[18] In his reply of July 2 Burke made no reference to Rockingham's comment, but he announced the publication of Meredith's pamphlet. At the same time, in connection with the proposed county petitions, he discussed many of the topics and delineated many of the arguments which ultimately were incorporated into the *Present Dicontents*.[19] Two weeks later (17 July), therefore, Rockingham again brought up the subject: "In one of your letters," he wrote, "you said you was revising some old Papers—I hope you go on with that work. I do believe it would do great Service. I am sure we never do ourselves much good but when we strictly adhere to our Line of Conduct. I wish the public had it fully laid before them."[20]

To this second urging Burke replied at the end of a long letter of July 30.[21] He was having trouble making progress, he declared, because of distraction and lack of time, on the one hand, and lack of a satisfactory controlling idea or formula, on the other. The distraction lay in his multifold activity in instigating and guiding the county meetings and in formulating the petitions. The other difficulty he described as finding an effective form for bringing his older materials up to date and giving them an organic relation to the newest developments. He thought that he might feel freer in producing something altogether new. "I had some notion of casting it into the form of a letter," he wrote, "addressed to a person who had long been in parliament, and is now retired with all his old principles and regards still fresh and alive;—I mean

[16] See, for example, Burke to O'Hara, 31 May, 1. June, 20 August 1769.

[17] Rockingham to Burke, 15 May 1769. Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield. I quote from these papers with the permission of Earl Fitzwilliam and the Trustees of the Fitzwilliam settled Estates.

[18] Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

[19] *Correspondence*, I, 168-171.

[20] Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

[21] *Correspondence*, I, 182.

old Mr. White.[22] I wish I knew whether your lordship likes this." His search for a dramatic conception rather than a formal logical structure as both the organizing principle and the generating impulse of a composition I find basic in Burke's processes of composition. John White, the independent gentleman, firm in his Revolution Whiggism, seemed the personification of the ideas Burke wished to animate anew.

Meanwhile, during the months of August and September, though Burke found few consecutive hours to work on the pamphlet, he managed to bring together much material which could be discussed with his colleagues. He had conferences with Dowdeswell who himself was writing a pamphlet and had come to Beaconsfield to commandeer Burke's assistance in bringing it to birth.[23]

This visit of Dowdeswell's produced an incident which may illustrate the distractions and involvements which Burke was subject to that summer, and also, perhaps, his preoccupation. During the visit the two men twice read over Dowdeswell's manuscript together. Apparently Burke approved but agreed that Dowdeswell ought to see one or two current publications before finally having the pamphlet published. Several weeks later Dowdeswell wrote Burke in a tone of injured righteousness: "Your last letter is very mortifying to me. You commend a pamphlet lately published & call it mine. My fear is that mine must have made little impression on you . . . while we were at Gregories. For mine is not publisht." He wonders whether he ought now to publish at all, if someone else has presented his materials in such a way as to make Burke unable to tell the difference.[24] He wrote much the same thing to Rockingham, using if anything a more aggrieved tone;[25] and Burke subsequently spent many precious hours soothing Dowdeswell's hurt feelings and urging him to go on and publish.

In late September, after much urging from the Marquis, Burke finally spent some days at Wentworth-Woodhouse, the Rockingham seat in Yorkshire, discussing what he had written and working out with Rockingham plans and ideas for the completion of the task.[26] However convenient it may be to work at such matters across a table rather than through the mails, the participants do not always favor the historian by preserving significant records of their conferences. We may lament, therefore, that we do not know what particular considerations impinged upon Burke's growing composition and altered its contents and structure. Two of those factors we can posit with some confidence: the success of some of the county meetings in stirring up the electorate over the Middlesex decision, and the increased intensity of the overtures for the Rockinghams to join the Grenvilles and Chatham in presenting the king with a new administration. The latter factor intensified the need, at least in Burke's and the Marquis' opinion, for Burke's pamphlet speedily to appear. Rockingham was as eager as Burke to have it finished, but he was far more sanguine about its possible usefulness.

After Burke's return to Beaconsfield

[22] John White, Member for Retford, one whom the Rockinghams were eager to have join them when they were preparing to form a government in 1765. See G. H. Guttridge, *The Early Career of Lord Rockingham, 1730-1765*, University of California Publications in History, Vol. XLIV (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1952), p. 40.

[23] Dowdeswell to Rockingham, 5 August 1769, Clements Library MS.; Burke to Rockingham, 30 July 1769, *Correspondence*, I, 179.

[24] 5 Sept. 1769, Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield. Dowdeswell's draft of this letter is in the Clements Library.

[25] 5 Sept. 1769, Clements Library.

[26] Burke to O'Hara, 20 August, 27 Sept., 1769.

and London, the Marquis continued urging him on to revising, rewriting, and finishing the pamphlet. He could see little hope of agreeing enough with the Grenvilles to form an administration unless they could be brought to his position, and he thought that Burke's principles if published widely might accomplish that miracle:

> I am exceedingly anxious, that the Pamphlet which you shewed me in such forwardness—when you was here—should make its Appearance as early as possible. In all Respects—Now is the Time—I wish it read by all the Members of Parlt—& by all the Politicians in Town & Country prior to the Meeting of Parlt. I think it would take universally, & tend to form and to unite a Party upon real & well founded Principles—which would in the End prevail & re-establish order & Government in this Country.[27]

During October, however, Burke was so busy with current political management, and so exhausted from the struggle to keep his gentlemen colleagues at work, that he made little progress in rewriting and finishing. His letters alone, during the summer and autumn, at least equaled the bulk of the pamphlet as we have it. He was being pressed, moreover, to go to Wentworth again in November for another meeting of the Rockingham leaders. This he begged off from so that he might finish the pamphlet, but he promised to send as much of it as he could for the consideration of that meeting. On October 29 he wrote Rockingham that he, too, was eager to have the job done, but he implied that he no longer thought it possible to unify the opposition on Rockingham's principles. All the available means of persuasion were not equal to that task. Something, however, was necessary to justify insistence upon disunity:

> I see, I feel, the necessity of justifying to our friends and to the world, the refusal, which is inevitable, of what will be thought very advantageous offers. This can only be done by showing the ground upon which the party stands, and how different its constitution, as well as the people who compose it, are from the Bedfords, and Grenvilles, and other knots, who are combined for no public purpose, but only as a means of furthering, with joint strength, their private and individual advantage.[28]

He despaired of accomplishing this design to his own satisfaction, but that day he had at last been able to get down to a little writing. By the time he finished the letter, two or three days later, Burke had hit upon a new design and had accomplished a little at the beginning of a new draft "not wholly to displease" himself. He had had to abandon old Mr. White and to change the whole plan from what the Marquis had seen, but not, he thought, for the worse. But, alas, again he had to break off to visit Lord Verney, who owned the borough for which Burke sat. As it happened, he got a little done at Verney's, and when he returned home, he set to the task in earnest again. He was finding, he wrote to Rockingham, that he had to "speak very broad" or "weaken the matter and make it vulgar and ineffectual"; in other words, unless this pamphlet were to seem like a narrow party complaint or a mere assault on persons and influences, it had to be set in a foundation of fundamental philosophy. But, he added: "I find some difficulties as I proceed; for what appear to me self-evident propositions, the conduct and pretenses of people oblige one formally to prove; and this seems to me, and to others, a dull and needless labor." He had read the pamphlet aloud to his brother and to his friend William Burke, and they had thought some things too ludicrous. He himself had thought otherwise, however, and had wished that more light detail had

[27] 15 October 1769, Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

[28] *Correspondence*, I, 203.

occurred to him; "for I know," he said, "how ill a long detail of politics, not animated by a direct controversy, wants every kind of help to make it tolerable." Much of it would soon be ready, but he feared that it would be long.[29]

Some time between the 6th and 14th of November, Burke sent a substantial portion of the revised manuscript to the conference at Wentworth, with a covering letter which shows signs of weariness and a suggestion of futility.[30] Apparently recent developments and extended consultation had made Burke wonder whether good political sense would permit publication at all; but if the party still wanted it, he was willing to go on. Against his own well-known inclinations, but in accord with rhetorical good sense, he had cut out an attack on Pitt which could only have brought charges of spiteful irreconcilability against the Rockinghams. The scheme had been altered, but he wished he had abandoned the old plan entirely, for it had embarrassed him a great deal.

Burke minced no words in stating the case against publication, first because the paper was a frontal attack upon the Court system, which would alienate the Court completely from the Rockinghams, and secondly, because he foresaw at the same time "that the other bodies who compose the opposition, will desire 'not to be comprehended in these declarations,' as G[eorge] G[renville] said, upon such an occasion, two years ago, so that you irritate, past forgiveness, the court party, and you do not conciliate all the opposition." "Besides," he continued, "I am very far from confident, that the doctrines avowed in this piece (though as clear to me as first principles) will be considered as well founded, or that they will be at all popular. If so we lose upon every side."

Burke then declared his own indifference to the publication. He asserted plainly, however, that if the piece were published, he wanted assurance that he and it would be supported by the chiefs of the party in the House of Commons. It must stand as the party's declaration, not his alone. "Let me know," he concluded, "what ought to be left out, what softened, and what strengthened."

From this time on, the appearance of the pamphlet before parliament should meet became more and more doubtful, in spite of Burke's and Rockingham's professed eagerness. The Marquis and Dowdeswell went over it carefully at Wentworth, and Rockingham made many notes. Then he sent the manuscript or copies of it by Dowdeswell to the Duke of Portland, the most important peer in the party other than the Marquis, and to Sir George Savile, soliciting criticism, as Burke had requested, from each.

In the meantime one of Burke's secondary concerns lay in seeing Dowdeswell's pamphlet through the press (perhaps, by way of expiating his earlier transgression) and arranging for its distribution through the country. Hence he wrote Rockingham that he could not send the rest of the *Discontents* yet. It was not in order, nor yet "quite finished, even in the scheme." He urged Rockingham, however, to send back the portion he had in his possession, if he approved, because time pressed. Praising Dowdes-

[29] *Ibid.*, I, 207, 213: 6 Nov. 1769.

[30] *Ibid.*, I, 197-200. On 4 Nov. Rockingham had written: "I anxiously wish that you would go on with the *Work in Hand*, the more & more I consider the Matter, in every light—I think it necessary, both in present View & also preparatory for what may happen. . . . I wish you was here. . . . Indeed if the *Work* was in such forwardness, that you could bring it—that our Friends might *see* & *sanctify*—that would be still Best. I know pretty well from the Conversations I have had with Several—that The Idea totally corresponds as much with their *present Sentiments*, as it does with all their *past Conduct*." Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

well's pamphlet, he included a sentence which he must have applied in his mind even more to his own unfinished work: "I am convinced that men want arguments, to reconcile their minds to what is done, as well as motives, originally to act right."[31]

On December 5 Burke was still waiting in some impatience for the manuscript and Rockingham's comments. He had not sent the rest to Wentworth, though he "was drawing to a conclusion," because he hoped that the Marquis would be in London shortly to make plans and organize the ranks for the opening of parliament. Both the publication of the pamphlet and Rockingham's presence in London were badly needed. The Grenvilles were letting it be understood that they and the Rockinghams were in complete harmony and that the Grenvilles would lead the combination. This idea Burke found it necessary to combat, be the consequences what they might, but he needed confirmation from the leader himself.[32]

In less than a week Rockingham replied that he would not be able to come to London until after the first of the year. This seemed to Burke a grave mistake, but he must have been disturbed besides by a paragraph in which his lordship advised caution in making any statements about what the Rockinghams would or would not do, until all were in town.[33] Here was not only a reproof to Burke for his comments about the Grenvilles, but a suggestion that perhaps the pamphlet was about to be abandoned, though Rockingham avoided any direct mention of it. Burke's reply on the 18th, therefore, indicated that he had ceased working on the manifesto because now it could not come out before the meeting of parliament, and because he took the Marquis's delay to mean that he was dissatisfied with either the scheme or the execution. "I am not surprised at it," he said. "In truth, if the thing were as well done as the Cause deserves & as I could wish, still some doubt might be entertained of the propriety of declaring agst the System of the Court unless that declaration could secure the People."[34] If it were suppressed then, however, Burke doubted that it should ever be published.

Meanwhile, Rockingham had had replies from both Portland and Sir George Savile. Portland approved heartily, and was disappointed only in the moderation with which the Earl of Bute had been treated. He could see no point in declaring war on the Court system and then measuring one's words in speaking of the author of that system. He offered his own testimony to the reality of Bute's responsibility, where Burke had been willing to suggest doubt or to treat Bute as merely the accidental agent of an inevitable conspiracy. That part Portland thought should be stiffened; and on the other hand he suggested taking out the remaining insinuations to the discredit of the other factions of opposition. "If they will assist us in pulling down what we wish to see demolished, why throw any obstacles in their way?" He could see no harm in the publication, and possible good.[35]

Sir George's response was both general and detailed and touched directly on the core of the matter:

> I make more remarks . . . than I should have hazarded if Mr B had not seem'd in his letter very desirous of every body's opinion, & not only so but indeed made it almost necessary to give the whole of one's thoughts by what he says of his expectations of support. . . . This made me look very sharp to find all the fault I could, & endeavour to set my Prejudices de-

[31] *Correspondence*, I, 217.
[32] *Ibid.*, I, 218-219.
[33] 9 Dec. 1769. Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.
[34] Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.
[35] Albemarle, *Memoirs of the Marquis of Rockingham* . . . (London, 1852), II, 145-147.

signedly against the natural propensity I might have to approve (or at least to admire in this case).

To discuss properly much of Savile's specific, detailed criticism, one would wish to have the manuscript which he saw. Neither it nor any manuscript of the *Discontents*, however, has been identified among the Burke papers. We may observe, nevertheless, that Savile is eager to remove verbal sources of possible irritation and misunderstanding, even though he himself understands what Burke intends. More generally, however, he agrees with Burke that the pamphlet will give offense to many people, and he wonders whether it is the kind of offense that an honest man must give under the circumstances, or only "of such a nature as to inflame . . . & do no real service; &, if so, harm." "Let us act," he continues, "so as not to be frightened afterwards ourselves at the work we have got into." If they should succeed in tearing down the system that the king has built, he asks, is there any real prospect of "uniting again a jot more soundly & sincerely" than when Rockingham was the head of the government? He is bothered by the curious circumstance that now, "The People finding out their representatives have betray'd them to the *Court* apply to the *K*[ing] to defend them." This is sound constitutional theory, he admits, "but hard enough to keep up gravely in practice." The pamphlet, he thinks, is ill-timed "just when we have got our grave looks & are taking the business in another way." At some points he thinks that the argument looks too much like a mere question of *who* should be in power; at others, it seems too theoretical. "Perhaps not. yet People in general Skip over mere truths."[36]

Sir George's four or five pages of analysis are the best efforts of the most friendly devil's advocate. He touches most of the points which hostile critics have labored ever since, the very points which Burke himself knew would be critical in the success of the manifesto. Though Savile's objections did not prevail in the final publication, they undoubtedly had much to do with Rockingham's quandary as late as December 23 when he sent the manuscript to Dowdeswell with instructions for him to discuss it with Burke in the light of notes which the Marquis and Dowdeswell had made when they had gone over it together. There was an accompanying letter to Burke, including further particulars, which may well have been Savile's annotations. With a kind of throwing up of the hands, Rockingham concluded his letter to Dowdeswell: "I wish it was possible that this work would soon make its appearance. I am only fearful that my own delay may have made it difficult."[37]

That is the last we hear of the pamphlet until after its publication four months later. The presence together in London of all the parties concerned made letter writing unnecessary, and we have no Boswellian minutes of their conversations. Some plausible conjectures, however, account for the sequel. In spite of the furor of the summer and the expectations of the opposition, the Court party did not give up. They were, as Burke had reported on December 18, "without being very sanguine about their success, resolved to fight it out." With the opening of the session in January, all branches of the opposition rose to the attack with vigor and apparent unanimity. Chatham showed the most extreme violence, with Colonel Barré's

[36] Sir George Savile to Rockingham, n.d. (Burke Papers 4A), Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

[37] Albemarle, *Rockingham*, II, 144-145; Fitzwilliam Papers, Sheffield.

help in the House of Commons, and the Rockinghams the greatest moderation. The government's majorities shrank alarmingly and at last the prime minister, Grafton, resigned in disgust and took the remaining moderates with him.

In the midst of the almost successful battle, therefore, there would be little time or excuse for Burke's pamphlet, and if a new government were about to be formed, good sense dictated that no additional affront be given to the king or to the probable allies. Neither Rockingham, nor Grenville, nor Chatham, however, succeeded Grafton. The king at last made the choice which settled matters for the next twelve years: on 28 January Lord North took the seals of office as head of the Treasury, and within a month the *King's Friends* were as secure as they had ever been. The excuse for love-making among the opposition leaders vanished in a very few weeks, and the reluctant wedding of the Rockinghams with the sons of Chatham was postponed until 1782. It cannot be said that Burke was happy, but his response to the union at the later date suggests that neither would he have been happy in a new ministry constituted as would have been necessary in 1770.

As the reason for harmony disappeared, so did the reason for uncongenial caution. The Rockinghams apparently agreed that the most they could accomplish was to set the record straight and wait for the general election of 1774. Burke's *Present Discontents* would set them right with the country and with themselves. It would vindicate their past behavior, forecast their future conduct, and do no present harm. And so, instead of coming out before parliament met, as a bid for power, it came out just before the close of the spring session, as a testament of honorable and honest intention.

For himself and for his party Burke had wrought well. To the peculiar demands of his task his organic methods of composition had been well adapted.[38] His work had grown and blossomed under the vicissitudes of changing seasons and enforced neglect, of pruning, cutting, grafting, uprooting, and replanting; and it survived to replenish the rhetoric of twelve long years of resistance alike to the new toryism of North and George III and the republicanism of the popular reformers. On 21 May Burke wrote to his friend O'Hara: ". . . the Pamphlet, which contains our Creed, has been received by the publick beyond my Expectations. The Courtiers admit it to be a piece of Gentlemanlike Hostility. The fiercest Enemies it has yet met with are in the republican faction"[39]—for Burke had disclaimed the favorite proposals of the reformers: annual parliaments, electoral reform, and a law excluding office-holders from seats in parliament. In June Burke's "kinsman" William wrote to this same O'Hara that because of the *Present Discontents* and of his speech on American affairs at the end of the session, Burke now "certainly stands higher than ever He did in his Life." "I had almost said," he added, "the highest of any man in the Country."[40]

[38] See note 13, above.
[39] O'Hara MSS, Microfilm, National Library of Ireland.
[40] *Ibid.*

NOTES ON FROST THE LECTURER

Reginald L. Cook

IN 1861, Lowell wrote that Emerson was "the most steadily attractive lecturer in America." "Mr. Emerson always draws." Interchange today the names of Robert Frost and Emerson in Lowell's statements, and no appreciable error would result except in time. Frost is to the lecture platform of the twentieth century what Emerson was to the Lyceum system. Emerson was one of the first American literary masters in the art of presenting one's ideas in public. Frost is an inheritor of that art. How he became a lecturer, what characterizes his pitch, and why he has been so successful on the platform are inquiries worth making.

He became a lecturer, not after careful preliminary training in public speaking, but from economic necessity. When he first spoke in public—at about forty—he said that his knees felt shaky, and he suffered so much from nervous indigestion that he had to see a doctor afterward. But he refused to talk with notes. He made himself stand before people and talk to the thought in his head.[1] "They need to get me right about talking and reading poems," he once said. "In the beginning I made up my mind that if the talking interfered with the poetry, then I wouldn't do it. The talking just wasn't that important. But I did it for fifty dollars because we needed the money to keep us going at home."[2]

Reginald L. Cook (B.A., Oxon, 1929) is Professor of American Literature at Middlebury College, and has served as Director of the Bread Loaf School of English.

[1] From talk with Frost at Ripton, Vt., Aug. 12, 1946.

[2] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, Vt., May 28, 1948.

He had been a teacher—at Pinkerton Academy for six years and for one at the New Hampshire State Normal School at Plymouth—before he made the great gamble on poetry. Upon his return from England in 1915, and following the recognition concomitant with the appearance of *A Boy's Will* and *North of Boston*, he combined teaching (at Amherst College) and lecturing with writing poetry. For over forty years he has made his living, as he puns effectively, by "barding round" at about twenty colleges annually. "I've made one-third of my living out of it," he estimates, and he refers to earning his way by lecturing in public as "a funny kind of fatality."[3] Significantly, he is his own agent and usually travels alone, clear across the country, on his rounds of barding. The lecturing has not only given him a chance "to say" his poems as only he knows how to say them, and thus gain an audience, but, more to the economic point, it has proved remunerative. "I'll talk (i.e., converse) for nothing," he will say, "but I won't lecture for nothing."[4]

He used to talk in the 1930's about how the reader was to take poetry. "Poetry is a way of being taken by those who know how to take it."[5] Now in the '50's, in the wake of the New Criticism, he is still concerned that the reader know how to take his poetry. When he reads "A Witch of Coös," he asks: "How do I mean to be taken?"

[3] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, May 9, 1952.

[4] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, June 4, 1948.

[5] Lecture at Middlebury College, May 27, 1936.

And in a tone slightly resigned, he refers to readers who persist in overreading or underreading the poems. "I try to get them right whether people understand them or not."[6] One of the chief aims in his talks is to give the auditor an opportunity to hear how he wants the poems to be taken and how he wants to be taken as a person.

Frost is, literally, a *show*man who, like any competent artist, tries to show rather than tell. At their best, the lectures are masterful performances, and like the performance of an athlete, he is either in or off form. One of the usual comments after a Frost talk concerns whether he was "in" form. "Sometimes I feel shapely; sometimes I sweat," he will remark about the lecture, depending upon how it has gone. From experience he knows what he is trying to do and how it should be done. He has come a long way since those early lectures when he used to read "Birches" and "The Sound of the Trees" and "The Road Not Taken," as he remarks, "like a rabbit running down a hole."[7]

Commonly he starts with a title that reflects the idea around which his thoughts group. These titles are revealing: "What Poetry Thinks"; "You Can't Improvise a Background"; "Stake out your Sky"; "On Being Let in on Symbols"; or "How to Live into Poems without Studying Them." Sometimes he has no formal title but points up the talk by focusing on education, or, as I once heard him, by focusing on the interrelationship of three words—democracy, war, and civilization. As Charles Eliot Norton Professor of Poetry at Harvard University in 1936, the general title of his lectures was "The Renewal of Words," and he named the separate lectures as follows: "The Old Way to be New"; "Vocal Imagination—the Merger of Form and Content"; "Does Wisdom Signify?"; "Poetry as Prowess"; "Before the Beginning of a Poem"; "After the End of a Poem." Sometimes he gives a single lecture, to be followed next day by a reading from the poems. Usually he warms up on an idea or two for a half hour and then reads from the poems for an hour, introducing each poem briefly and commenting on it after the reading. I have seldom heard him lecture and read for less than an hour and a half, and I have often heard him still going strong and engagingly after two hours. He gives unsparingly, often reading several poems for encores.

Of his method in the beginning, he once said sharply: "I didn't want to prepare a paper. I could have taken a subject, let us say, doors: indoors, outdoors, folding doors, sliding doors, and even bedroom doors, and talked on the relationship between them, but I didn't want to be that systematic. I didn't want to make it that formal. I wanted only to take a few ideas and hang them together in making points. I try out some ideas and work them up in a talk which I give four or five times until I'm tired of it. Then maybe some part of it comes to mind later and I use it."[8] He is not systematic; he is not a careful developer and resolver of issues or conflicting ideas. He is a ruminator, and, as he rambles, he ruminates about what interests him, always trying to give it a fresh twist. Listening to him, you realize that it is the poet in his solitude who hears best the sound of the world. The idea or thread of thought starts him going, and the rest is a curious and often wonderful making of

[6] Lecture at Bread Loaf School of English, June 26, 1952.

[7] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, May 9, 1952.

[8] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, May 28, 1948.

thought directly before your eyes. Once, at a mid-western college, just before he was to begin a lecture, someone piqued him by a reference to Plato's "Republic," and he launched off on a remarkable impromptu excursus on Plato. Yet what appears to be impromptu usually has a long foreground. A long-time reader of Plato who puts down no notes, keeps no journals, he was ready, and the occasion was right. It is like the timing in the fusion bomb. On these occasions he launches out beyond the spatial frontiers of conventional thinking, just as he does in private conversation. So I have heard him frequently, over a thirty-year span. It always happens unexpectedly, without windup or fanfare, without pretense or show of temperament. I doubt that he could anticipate the occasions. Probably, as he says about the poems, they come when one is in "an optimum condition."

A deceptive air of nonchalance might lead the uninitiated to assume that he regards the lecturing lightly. But the facts points to an opposite conclusion. Once, in the spring of 1950, he was troubled about a speech he had to make before the members of the Academy of Arts and Sciences. "What shall I do?" he asked at a loss. Someone suggested that he should develop an introductory theme—on narrative poetry—which he had just used successfully in another lecture. Well, he didn't know about it, and it was not difficult to see how concerned he was. A few weeks later, when asked how the speech went, he answered: "Oh, all right, I guess. It's for other people to say."[9] He is as responsible in lecturing as he is in his poetry, and just as he depends upon mood in the poem, so does he in the lecture. Once, before a lecture, he said: "I won't talk much; I'm going into the silences now."[10] And he didn't talk until it was time to speak. Apparently, he depends upon imagination activating a deliberately relaxed sensibility.

"Sometimes they get me wrong when I talk," he explains. "Someone at the Phillips Exeter Academy just wrote how I 'strolled' through my talk." Frost was not unduly upset but just dismayed that the young reporter had missed the point —one of his favorites—which was based on the fourth chapter of Mark, eleventh and twelfth verses. It was the idea that parables are for the right ones, so the wrong ones can't be saved. As he usually does in a lecture, he worked up deliberately to his idea that only those with understanding — acumen — could grasp metaphor, and that they were definitely not common but uncommon or exceptional people.[11] Someone in the audience thought he had spoken words against the common man. Surely, the word for Frost is elusive, not evasive. The initiated learn how to take him.

There is the matter of tone. The way to take him is to get the tone of voice right in the context. How did he say it? Aye, there's the leverage. Was the voice-tone ironic or impish, serious or jibing, tart or bantering, gentle or caustic? The nub of his art on the platform is as personal as breathing is to his voice.

What you hear in his speech is what you hear in the poem—the blending of a finely controlled voice in tone and emphasis, and in rhythm and personal phrasing. Consider how he inflects common workaday words, like "temper," "renewal," "performance," giving them their measure, proportion, and due weight. "A teacher must have the right *temper* to teach a course." "Poetry is a

[9] From talk with Frost at Ripton, June 29, 1950.

[10] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, May 9, 1952.

[11] From talk with Frost at Middlebury, May 28, 1948.

renewal of words." "Art is a *performance* in height." In baseball parlance, Frost is a control pitcher, who doesn't throw out his arm with the pitch or let the ball sail off the finger tips. You leave the lecture hall recalling the talk by the images some of the key words evoke.

Consider how he dramatizes the literal by the voice. It is like an incantation. To dramatize the importance of "bright" ideas in writing, he uses the metaphor of a starry sky, and, in an opening gambit, he says: "You've watched the sky break out—as evening deepens—in stars. You're staking out the stars. As evening deepens there are constellations—figures not as close as art makes them but very close: the Bull, Orion, the Northern Cross. You stake out the sky with your bright ideas as life darkens, and, as you grow older, you'll have them as systems. That's your maturing. Bright ideas come all the way down the ages and they got into someone's poems recently."[12] Then he illustrates the appearance of "bright ideas" in his own poetry, but it is apparent that the effectiveness of his metaphor is partly tonal by the pitch of his voice, which is unemphatic, as if the poet directed image and insight and self-revelation at a similar naturalness and simplicity in his auditors. The image of the writer and the starry sky is provocative; the voice tone is incantatory.

Consider how he packs meaning in an aphorism. "You can't paint the source of light."[13] "The whole art of writing is having something to say."[14] "Every subject is all subjects."[15] "Everything (in poetry) is hinting."[16] "Repression instead of expression—that's it."[17] "Felicity (in writing), not facility."[18] Or consider how his thought carries the personal impress. "I'd rather be an aesthetician than an aesthete."[19] "I love to see the arrogancies of any kind brought low."[20] "I don't want to grant that spontaneity can be simulated."[21] "How I loathe set figures."[22] "I like people who can tell a story without seemingly being for or against somebody."[23] And consider how he ranges, drawing his allusions from far and wide, in and out of literature. Not only has he an extensible mind, elastic and resilient, which exhibits a power to connect "remote ideas," as Dr. Holmes would say, "by partial resemblances," but he has a remarkably apt and retentive memory. Offhand in his lectures he quotes the writers in the great tradition—Shakespeare or Keats, Campion or Landor, Smart or Tennyson—as though he were going on or returning from a journey peopled with recognitions. These were all friends, all intimates with whom he mingled as an equal, and he quoted them as though they were of his time as well as their own.

Of course Frost's talent for entertaining has not been a liability. He reflects everything the bill of rights guaranteed him and in addition a saving grace of humor. Perhaps it is his humor—the quips, the cracks, the pleasantries—that

[12] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 16, 1952.
[13] Lecture at Bread Loaf School of English, July 28, 1952.
[14] *Ibid.*
[15] Talk with Frost at Ripton, Sept. 26, 1953.
[16] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 16, 1952.
[17] Talk at Bread Loaf School of English, July 28, 1952.
[18] Talk with Frost at Middlebury, Oct. 6, 1952.
[19] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 19, 1953.
[20] Talk with Frost at Middlebury, Oct. 3, 1953.
[21] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 19, 1953.
[22] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 16, 1952.
[23] Lecture at Middlebury College, May 10, 1950.

helps most to keep him within communicating distance of his audience. His humor is of two sorts. There is the light, off-the-cuff quipping, and there is also a dead-pan humor.

Once he was distinguishing between free verse and regular metre. "In the Bay of Bengal/I lost my all," he improvised.[24] That was regular metre, he explained. Then he continued: "In the Bay of Bengal/I lost my shirt." That's free verse for you, he implied. There was a murmur of laughter. "If I wanted to get shirt in," he added, "I'd say Mount Desert." This remark was good for another moderate laugh. Then he started to play with the jingle. Each fresh improvisation increased the tempo and spontaneity of the laughter until, with the audience's imagination at tension pitch, he said abruptly—and with inflected tone—"In Paris, France," and then he stopped. No one in the audience spoke out audibly, but every one there must have finished the couplet. It was risqué but neat; it scored a point and relaxed the audience. The evening was his.

Or once, in a display of dead-pan humor, he began a lecture by offering three suggestions to his audience of writers: (1) Read nothing but translations; (2) imitate someone who hasn't been imitated for a long time; and (3) make every line a slogan.[25] You would have to know a little about Frost to catch the nuance in the suggestions and the inflection of the voice. Obviously the first two were to be avoided and the third to be accepted. Glance around at the audience and it would appear that at first few had caught the play of his mind. But he kept playing until after a while the audience warmed up. "When I talk somewhere I like to be rascally," he explains. "That's what stimulates me."[26]

Indeed, a rascally player is what Frost really is—a dramatizer of ideas and an entertainer whose pitch happens to be poetry. The voice, although a major part of the play, is augmented by the constant gesture of the hands, the frequent nod of the head, the changing facial expression, and even the stance, squared away, confronting his auditors, and depending very much upon the feel of the group. What the human aspects —the voice, gesture, expression, and appearance—represent is a natural presence not soon forgotten. Frost behaves as he looks. You never see him when he affects the poet, and you never hear him when he isn't one. He has to be seen in the changing light of temperament—the light now shadowing, now showing forth the poet, always the same, yet always different, because he is invariably unpredictable. I have heard him when it seemed he assumed his audience was a jury before whom he must present a case for poetry. Unsparingly he arraigned his critical opponents in other fields—especially the scientists—with a bill of particulars. Sometimes too he is like a cornered bowman who keeps drawing satirical shaft after shaft from a thick quiver, which he drives forcefully with a twanging bowstring. There are times too when his audience is dismayed at unseemly references to negroes as "niggers," or his jibes at other poets, notably T. S. Eliot. But, if you estimate a lecturer by how he leaves an auditor, his average performance leaves you more than commonly stimulated by the play of mind.

Paraphrasing Dr. Johnson, we might say that "every lecturer does not talk

[24] Lecture at Bread Loaf School of English, June 29, 1950.

[25] Lecture at Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, Aug. 26, 1949.

[26] Talk with Frost at Middlebury, June 4, 1950.

for every listener." Frost has won his full share of addicts, and one of the most interesting phenomena is his quiet self-possession when surrounded by opponents or by people with opposing ideas and attitudes. His mental agility is astonishing, and he cows most opponents by wit, if he does not confound them by point of view. Another interesting phenomenon is his appearance in the world of institutionalized education. An old campaigner, he knows how to get his palace guard of college professors to schedule lecture readings for him, and, what is more to the point, in his performance he knows how to stand squarely behind his convictions and shoot at the whites of the eyes before him. College lecture halls have been his hustings, where he felt right at home. There he talked most effectively to the ones who count—the students—and, like Justice Holmes, he has been greatly appealing to the young. Students trust Frost because they find in his free spirit and deceptively simple verbal thrusts the expression of a way of life which they admire. And he has appealed to the elders because, like Cato, he is a very original speaker—*vir bonus dicendi peritus* (a man of high character who can make a good speech).

LINCOLN THE ORATOR

He was careless of his dress, and his clothes, instead of fitting neatly as did the garments of Douglas on the latter's well-rounded form, hung loosely on his giant frame. As he moved along in his speech he became freer and less uneasy in his movements; to that extent he was graceful. He had a perfect naturalness, a strong individuality; and to that extent he was dignified. He despised glitter, show, set forms, and shams. He spoke with effectiveness and to move the judgment as well as the emotions of men. There was a world of meaning and emphasis in the long, bony finger of his right hand as he dotted the ideas on the minds of his hearers. Sometimes, to express joy or pleasure, he would raise both hands at an angle of about fifty degrees, the palms upward, as if desirous of embracing the spirit of that which he loved. If the sentiment was one of detestation—denunciation of slavery, for example—both arms, thrown upward and fists clenched, swept through the air, and he expressed an execration that was truly sublime. This was one of his most effective gestures, and signified most vividly a fixed determination to drag down the object of his hatred and trample it in the dust.

He always stood squarely on his feet, toe even with toe; that is, he never put one foot before the other. He neither touched nor leaned on anything for support. He made but few changes in his positions and attitudes. He never walked backward and forward on the platform. To ease his arms he frequently caught hold, with his left hand, of the lapel of his coat, keeping his thumb upright and leaving his right hand free to gesticulate. . . .

As he proceeded with his speech the exercise of his vocal organs altered somewhat the tone of his voice. It lost in a measure its former acute and shrilling pitch, and mellowed into a more harmonious and pleasant sound. His form expanded, and, notwithstanding the sunken breast, he rose up a splendid and imposing figure. . . . His little gray eyes flashed in a face aglow with the fire of his profound thoughts; and his uneasy movements and diffident manner sunk themselves beneath the wave of righteous indignation that came sweeping over him. Such was Lincoln the orator.

Herndon, as quoted by Philip Van Doren Stern, *The Life and Writings of Abraham Lincoln* (New York: The Modern Library, 1940), pp. 74-75.

CHOOSING LITERATURE FOR ORAL READING: A PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS

Wilma H. Grimes

IN spite of I. A. Richards' contention that the psychologist is suspect when he approaches the arts, the literary artist and critic have made thorough use of psychological findings. The psychological influences which have permeated all areas of thought in our time have as a matter of course affected the textbooks and teachings of oral interpretation. Consequently, certain concepts of psychology seem not only germane, but fundamental, to the purpose of the oral interpreter, who is avowedly dedicated to the communication of the meaning of literature in its entirety to a given body of listeners.

Of first importance to the oral interpreter is the concept that human activity is reducible to a stimulus-response situation. For the purpose of this paper, it would be convenient if the stimulus could be regarded as a single primary force playing upon a set of passive senses, but a reader-audience situation is complex, not simple. The stimulus includes not only the material presented, but the reader's voice and appearance, although the part of the stimulus which concerns us here is the material chosen. The response likewise is complex and multiple, not only because of the numbers of listeners, but because of the predispositions, attitudes, and states which exist among them. Response, which has been variously designated as full realization, empathy, enjoyment, and appreciation will in this paper be defined as the test of meaning in a given situation.[1]

Such a definition of response brings us directly to the second psychological concept with which the interpreter needs to concern himself: this is the notion that experience is dynamic, possessing a fluidity which results from the interplay of stimulus and response.[2] The idea that stimulus and response bear a reciprocal relationship to each other is clearly embodied in the following summary of the Gestalt point of view:

> In particular the work of Gestalt psychologists on perception . . . has helped to establish the fact of structural properties of wholes, interdependence of parts, qualitative transformations with the coming of new factors into the situation. For example, it has shown us that the qualitatively distinct character of perception of form, melody, rhythm, meaning, is not derived from the distinct properties of the parts in isolation, but that (on the contrary) the parts derive their quality from their functional membership in the whole.[3]

In applying the concept of the interdependence of parts and the qualitative transformation of wholes to the reading situation, specifically to the task of choosing literature for reading aloud, we are shifting the emphasis from the usual consideration of the reader's analysis of material and use of platform techniques to the problematical element

Wilma H. Grimes (Ph.D., Illinois, 1953), is Assistant Professor of Speech and Director of the Readers' Workshop at the University of Washington in Seattle. She is the author of two articles on humor in public address (SM, XXII, pp. 217-226, 243-255) *and coauthor of a current series in the* ST *entitled "Paperbacks: The Teachers' Friend."*

[1] George Herbert Mead, *Mind, Self, and Society*, ed. Charles W. Morris (Chicago, 1934), pp. 77-78.

[2] Mead, p. 25. See also John Dewey's *Art As Experience* (New York, 1934), p. 35.

[3] Muzafer Sherif, *An Outline of Social Psychology* (New York, 1948), p. 227.

of response. In the reader-audience situation, the structure of the stimulus is important; the reading should be unified, varied, fully assimilated, and fully projected by the reader. Yet, further, during the process of assimilation, the reader needs to appraise thoughtfully the group pressures and probable internal forces working in each listener to affect the nature of his response. Only by anticipating a response can a reader anticipate the structure of his own interpretation. The implication is simply that the social situation, enlarging communication even while it reduces individual responses,[4] enriches the values of expression because the response of the group becomes a stimulus to the reader whose reaction to both audience and literature causes him to send out a recharged stimulus that again comes back to him with further enrichment. Thus the entire continuous process is a truly creative, truly fluid, and cumulative movement from the initial impulse to "final" or culminating response.

If our purpose is to insure the creative conditions of art itself in the reading situation, we need to provide for mutual activity on the part of reader and audience. The question that this paper must answer is: what factors in the stimulus best provide for active response on the part of the listener? The three significant characteristics of a responsive audience which I shall discuss are (1) common traditions, with especial emphasis upon common language; (2) sufficient artistic perception and discrimination; and (3) a willing objectivity.

A common set of traditions is vital to the sharing of literature. These common traditions include morals, manners, politics, and above all, language. When people share traditions and a symbol system, deep social involvement results.[5] On the other hand, a foreigner who has acquired an adequate command of American-English will still miss some of the best of certain representative American authors, e.g., Sinclair Lewis, Willa Cather, Sherwood Anderson, because the connotations which these writers yield to a native American are likely to be incomplete for one of different heritage. Even when traditions are fully shared, meaning can be only approximate, as writer, reader, and listener have not lived through the same experience in the same way. For the oral reader the bond of language is at once an asset and a liability. He can never assume that, because a word on a page leaps at him with striking force, it will have equal force for others. When he conveys the power of the word, he is an interpreter. But suppose the word offends the listener or leads him to a hazy or inaccurate referent? Failure to go beyond the word to the referent is failure in understanding, for "there is no such thing as merely reading words; always through the words we are trafficking with things, things gone by, present, to come, or eternal."[6] And these *things*[7] are concrete only because of past experience, the memory of which aids in the recognition and reassembling of the stimuli we meet at any given instant. Faulty understanding inhibits the process of reassembling, and consequently, the response.

Audience receptivity, thus limited by traditions and language, is further circumscribed by perception and discrim-

[4] Sherif, p. 101.

[5] Suzanne Langer, *Feeling and Form* (New York, 1953), p. 220.

[6] I. A. Richards, *How To Read A Page* (New York, 1942), p. 20.

[7] In his use of the word *things*, Richards suggests that his referents are not only material objects and other locutions, but psychological experiences, feelings, emotions, as well.

ination,[8] in which memory of past experience again figures, since "every stimulus which is ever received leaves behind it . . . an imprint, a trace capable of being revived later and of contributing its quota to consciousness and to behaviour."[9] While every individual has the potential capacity to appreciate art, as evidenced by the universal interest in color, rhythm, storytelling, and dancing,[10] habits of living and thinking and striving often leave little room in our society for the development of potential appreciations. Responsiveness, like talent, may of course be heightened or reduced by experience.[11] In respect to responsiveness, we are forced to admit different levels of perception, indicating degrees of education and maturity.

An oral interpreter ideally possesses perception and discrimination and a wide knowledge of literature. His past experience qualifies him to meet an audience, and yet may keep him from doing so if he is unaware of the probable gaps between his perceptions and theirs.

There are various methods of bridging such gaps. The interpreter can present literature which is meaningful to him with the hope that his skill will make him an active agent for arousing meanings in the minds of his listeners; or he can somewhat more realistically search for literature which will be pleasant to his own taste, but also go further toward meeting the backgrounds of his audience. Or, as sometimes occurs, he can stubbornly refuse to allow for differences, asserting that what is good for one (himself) is good for all. The majority of teachers of literature and oral interpretation have abandoned this extreme position, and even though regretful, they practice a compromise. They take into account age differences and other factors; conflicting interests; secondary school tendencies to omit literature, foreign languages, and classical studies; a present emphasis upon the vocational aspects of education. Folk literature—old and new ballads, fables, legends, hero tales (even Ernie Pyle's reporting)—may serve as a beginning for an audience which is not literary. The narrative as a rule demands less from the listener than does the reflective lyric, for example. I am not suggesting that lyrics are to be avoided. I am advocating a kind of campaign, a strategy, for building taste by capturing interest instead of killing it. Allowing for existing differences means that we appraise as best we can the literary sophistication of an audience before choosing literature. If one accepts the idea that the test of meaning lies in an active response, he will try to give his audience the experience of comprehension accompanied by satisfaction. In the classroom, excitement, curiosity, wonder, puzzlement, and challenge may be highly satisfactory responses; from the platform, puzzlement at least should be held to a minimum. Sufficient satisfaction will soften the Spartan discipline of good poetry[12] and furnish a foundation for improved taste. Just as artists themselves grow so that their earliest experiments differ markedly from the works of their maturity, so the taste of an audience, especially of a student audience, will change. For some of them, the shift from Service to Auden is less painful than the one from green olives to ripe. As teachers, we are committed to a belief in change—a change bring-

[8] Sherif, p. 1.
[9] I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, (London and New York, 1925), p. 103.
[10] DeWitt Y. Parker, *The Principles of Aesthetics*, 2nd ed. (New York, 1947), p. 282.
[11] Langer, p. 396.
[12] See I. A. Richards, *Practical Criticisms*, p. 254.

ing increased awareness, receptivity, and discrimination.[13]

A third, and perhaps the most necessary, ingredient in the active response is a state of objectivity, a clearing the mind of "intellectual prejudices and false conceptions that inhibit people's natural responsiveness."[14] As Dewey explained it: "the idea of disinterestedness, detachment, and 'psychic distance' . . . are to be understood in the same way as contemplation. 'Disinterestedness' cannot signify uninterestedness. But it may be used as a roundabout way to denote that no specialized interest holds sway. 'Detachment' is a negative name for something extremely positive. . . . Participation is so thoroughgoing that the work of art is detached and cut off from the kind of specialized desire that operates when we are moved to appropriate a thing physically."[15] Now, it is one thing to ask that an audience bring to a reading situation an attitude of objectivity; it is quite another to ask that a reader choose literature which will foster objectivity, avoiding controversial topics which might stir prejudices or incur wrath. While it may be true that nearly all good readers—and listeners—"are very little disturbed by even a direct opposition between their own beliefs and the beliefs of the poet,"[16] some of our audiences are composed of poor readers, or of persons who read very little. Even among professors of literature, there have recently been contradictory evaluations of such individuals as Ezra Pound; in the last century Whitman was the subject of conflicting comment. Sometimes careful consideration of religious, racial, and political affiliations within a group will prepare a reader for a lack of objectivity in members of his audience. If, after such consideration, he chooses the "shock" technique, he will need to present his stimulus with care, perhaps allowing time for post-discussion. Above all, he must weigh his own motives. If he is using literature to stir the audience to sympathy for the problems a negro faces in a world of white supremacy, what selection will best accomplish his purpose? Should he seek empathy through Langston Hughes' poetry, or give a cutting of *Strange Fruit,* or present parts of *Cry the Beloved Country?* Time and place will enter his decision, as will the question of whether full, pleasurable participation in a work of art is requisite to the arousal of empathy. Certainly *disinterestedness* is less likely to exist with a reading about the negro in the United States than with a reading about him in South Africa.

At the outset I raised the question: what factors best provide for the full participation of an audience in the literature chosen for oral interpretation, a communicative situation? I have selected common traditions (with especial emphasis upon common language), sufficient artistic perception and discrimination, and a willing objectivity as the three significant characteristics of a responsive audience. But the reader himself is involved in the response which he seeks to evoke, involved to such an extent that often his preparation is looked upon as the greatest factor in the communicative situation. It is not my in-

[13] Paul Engle and Warren Carrier have constructed their *Reading Modern Poetry* (New York, 1955) on this belief in change, or so it seems from their statement of plan: "The editors wish to point out that the poems here are arranged not in chronological order, but in an order running generally from the simple to the more difficult, with the explanations becoming more complete as the book goes on. This means that Gerard Manley Hopkins will be found toward the end . . . and next to him . . . Hart Crane . . . while the first poems in the book are by Robert Frost."

[14] Langer, p. 396.

[15] Dewey, pp. 257-258.

[16] *Practical Criticism,* p. 271.

tention to discount the reader's responsibility as an artist who reorganizes his own experience and in so doing, aids his listeners in a similar reorganization. If the oral reader takes the best poetry and reads into it just what he already has in his mind, without using it as a means for changing his ideas, what is he achieving? Not a response, as we have defined it, but merely a projection of self, as one-sided as though only the stimulus were active. In a full experience of life or art, stimulus and response must act in order to interact; neither can be passive. The passive reader is not experiencing literature and neither is his audience. Only by going through nearly the same process of organization as the literary artist underwent can the oral reader realize vividly the piece of literature in its artistic entirety and thus kindle a like realization in his audience. Undoubtedly the creative and recreative artist are subject to one basic limitation: they must possess a sharp interest in the material they employ.[17] Possessing this interest, they can mould their material into a new experience by the act of artistic reorganization.

Further, in considering all the factors of the stimulus-response situation, the oral reader sensibly attempts to meet his actual audience (even while he may be envisioning an ideal audience) and accordingly analyzes carefully the style and content of the literature he plans to present. He will recall that the gap between good written and good spoken style has not completely disappeared, even with our current emphasis upon simplicity in writing. As Aristotle pointed out long ago, "the style of written prose is not that of spoken oratory . . ." and the spoken style "better admits of dramatic delivery."[18] Without proposing that oratory and oral interpretation need satisfy identical criteria, I should like to suggest that certain poems, tales, and essays read much better out loud than others. Everyone knows that Thurber, Leacock, and Benchley read well aloud, but has everyone discovered that Churchill, Logan Pearsall Smith, and Montaigne are equally effective before an audience? Novels and plays can be cut so that action, character, or theme, as needed, can emerge clearly. So can longer narratives. Recently many of us have enjoyed arrangements of *John Brown's Body*, *Western Star*, and *The Ring and the Book*. Because of their pervasive moods, the short stories of Poe and Hardy, not usually designated as "action" stories, read astonishingly well. Doubtless because of "their spoken style," stories of James M. Barrie[19] and scenes from Dickens's novels[20] have been successfully read before present day audiences, despite the fact that customs and problems in these writings are often highly localized.

In his effort to meet the backgrounds of those before him, the oral interpreter needs to avoid the temptation of choosing material which has already become very familiar. It is his duty to shun that which has been aesthetically exploited (for some poems, e.g., Amy Lowell's "Patterns," have suffered the fate of Gainsborough's *Blue Boy* and Whistler's *Mother*). Meaningful referents underlie many works of value which have the quality of freshness, and with a little extra effort, the reader can bring these works to his audience. Lowell's "The Day That Was That Day" is sel-

[17] Dewey, p. 189.

[18] Rhetorica, 1413b 1-3, 9, trans. W. Rhys Roberts, *Basic Works of Aristotle*, ed. Richard McKeon (New York, 1941).

[19] e.g., "How Gavin Birse Put It To Mag Lownie."

[20] See Theresa Murphy, "Interpretation in the Dickens Period," *QJS*, XLI (1955), 243-249. Laughton, of course, has used Dickens with much success.

dom read, although it has an intensity equalling that in "Patterns." Robert Bridges' love sonnets might well be read by the same young women who fix upon "How Do I Love Thee?" and Morris's "Two Red Roses Across the Moon" has finer music than "The Highwayman"—and what is more, a happy ending which is aesthetically satisfying.

As an artist, the oral interpreter faces squarely the question, "Is my art meaningful?" With a few exceptions, great poets have had to wait for a response, the test of meaning. But the oral reader needs instant response—he will lose his audience if he fails to get it. At first glance, this need for immediate response appears to be a handicap, pinning the reader to obvious techniques and popular literature. A longer look, however, suggests that the oral reader is in an enviable position, as enviable as that of the musical virtuoso who carries his listeners through the mazes of contrapuntal melody. The oral interpreter can help to bridge the gap between the creative artist and the people who have not yet realized the potency of art in their lives. By sharing his explorations with his public and helping them to clarify their emotions as he is clarifying his, the literary artist, reader or writer, can provide a moment, or an hour, of communicative experience, in which the universality of art triumphs over the differences between our self-styled intelligentsia, exiled artists, and the advocates of practical success. If the oral reader wins instant response, he has a chance of earning for himself and his art a more lasting response which will in turn become stimulus for further response. And he can always with other artists work to create an audience to which he can communicate fully. "In the end, works of art are the only media of complete and unhindered communication between man and man that can occur in a world full of gulfs and walls that limit community of experience."[21]

[21] Dewey, p. 105.

BREVITY IN SPEECHES

All enduring speeches have been comparatively short. None of the sermons of Jesus could, by any possibility, have occupied three quarters of an hour, and most of them must have been less than half as long. It is curious how perfectly His familiar talks fit the scientific theory of the university lecture.

During the seventeenth century the university custom became general of limiting lectures to one hour. More than two hundred years ago professors in German universities, for purely practical reasons, shortened the lecture to forty-five minutes.

Within the last thirty-five years, it was demonstrated that this limit is a scientific one, for Dr. Leo Bürgerstein, of Vienna, proved that, except under extraordinary circumstances, attention begins to lag after three quarters of an hour—this even with the young, fresh, eager minds of students. With miscellaneous audiences the risk of speaking for a longer time is, of course, much greater. Remember also that it is hard for any but an uncommonly vigorous and retentive intellect to grasp more than a very few ideas at one time.

So be as brief as you are simple, as plain as you are fair, and, content with a good job well done, stop when you are through.

Albert J. Beveridge, *The Art of Public Speaking* (Boston and New York, 1924), pp. 66-67.

JOHN PICKERING'S "UNIFORM ORTHOGRAPHY"

Cj Stevens

ORTHOGRAPHIC confusion in the representation of North American Indian languages led, in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, to an orderly and workable linguistic creation by the eminently logical and practical New England jurist and philologist, John Pickering. This work was his "Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America."[1] Paradoxically, Pickering's carefully wrought scheme had little effect on subsequent transcriptions of Indian languages; on the other hand, it had a profound and lasting effect on a non-American language, the language of the Sandwich Islands.

Pickering, a talented and recognized linguist even in early manhood, had had a tentative interest in Indian languages which was suddenly crystallized early in 1819 by a report made by Peter S. Du Ponceau to the Historical Committee of the American Philosophical Society.[2] This report was in the nature of a progress report, made two years after Du Ponceau had begun a correspondence with John Heckewelder, Moravian missionary among the Delaware Indians. It deals chiefly with the nature and extent of Du Ponceau's investigations, and it consists of generalizations with little specific linguistic data and almost no phonological data. Du Ponceau sent copies to Pickering and thus began a lifelong friendship and voluminous correspondence between the two men.

The need for a uniform orthography for the recording of Indian languages swiftly became apparent to both Du Ponceau and Pickering. Both men, at the outset of this linguistic interest, dealt principally with written records left by early missionaries. Du Ponceau did research on the works of David Zeisberger, Heckewelder's predecessor among the Delawares. Both Zeisberger and Heckewelder used German sound values in their transcriptions. Zeisberger, because of a shortage of type, used, understandably, *k*, *c*, and *g* interchangeably. Pickering reveals in a letter to Du Ponceau that he had examined John Eliot's *Indian Bible* and that he was "engaged in reducing [Roger] Williams' Vocabulary of the Narragansett language into alphabetical order, following his orthography. . . ."[3] He had also come into possession of a manuscript dictionary of the Norridgewock dialect, composed by a Jesuit missionary, Father Rasle, in French and Indian. The works of other early missionaries were investigated by these two scholars, including (by Du Ponceau) Johannes Campanius' transcription of the Lutheran "Little Catechism," in which the European language used was Swedish. Also, both ultimately came into contact with the works of various Spanish missionaries with respect to South and Central

Cj Stevens (Ph.D., Louisiana State University, 1954) is Director of Radio and Television and Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Kansas City, Kansas City, Missouri.

[1] John Pickering, "On the adoption of a Uniform Orthography for the Indian Languages of North America," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* (Cambridge: Hilliard and Metcalf, 1821), IV, 319-360.

[2] Peter S. Du Ponceau, "Report on the General Character and Forms of the Languages of the American Indians," *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia: Abraham Small, 1819), I, xvii-xlvi.

[3] Mary Orne Pickering, *Life of John Pickering* (Boston: University Press, 1887), pp. 281-282.

American Indian languages. In addition, there existed miscellaneous American collections of Indian words and phrases in which the phonetic values of the orthographic symbols were likely to vary from compiler to compiler. It is understandable, then, that Pickering should write:

> At the very commencement of my inquiries . . . I found my progress impeded by a capricious and ever varying *orthography* of the Indian languages, not only among the writers of different nations, but even among those of the same country. I have, therefore, while examining words in one Indian dialect with a view to comparing them with those of another, been obliged to employ much time in first settling the spelling of a *written word*, in order to ascertain the sound of the *spoken* word; when I ought to have found nothing more to be necessary than to make the comparison, which I happened to have in view, between words whose *sounds* should have presented themselves upon the first inspection of their written characters. . . .[4]

To remedy this exasperating confusion, Pickering proposes (p. 325) a uniform orthography, ". . . for the Indian, as well as other languages, which have no written characters." Pointing out the confusion of English orthography, he adopts what he calls (p. 329) "the *foreign* sounds of all the vowels . . . the sounds which are usually given to them by those European nations, with whom we have much intercourse . . . and who, like ourselves, use the Roman alphabet. . . ." Pickering's linguistic orientation, it should be understood, was in a large sense toward Europe. He was already established as a classical scholar before beginning his study of the Amerindian languages. His early practical linguistic achievements were in European languages. His early scholarly contacts were with European savants. It was natural, aside from reasons of phonetic logic, that he should thus plan the basis for his proposed orthography.

Pickering gives (p. 329) the pronunciation of the vowels as follows:

a as in *father*
e as in *there*
i as in *machine* (or like *ee*)
o as in *note*
u as in *rule*
y as in *you* (or like *ee*)

With the exception of *y* (where his treatment is probably a carry-over from the habitual viewing of *y* as both consonant and vowel), this could hardly be improved upon. If one considers, first, Pickering's concept of the "foreign" sound of the letters and, secondly, the traditional views of quantity—of "long" and "short" vowels—it is obvious that his representation is essentially phonemic, rather than phonetic.

Pickering avoids the pitfall of orthographic confusion with respect to both [j] and [w], for while *y* is used both as [j] and [i] (and [ɪ]), nevertheless *y* is consistently employed for [j] and *w* for [w]. This avoids awkward transcription such as would be necessary with Benjamin Franklin's system.[5] Franklin proposed *i* for [ɪ], *ii* for [i] and *i* for [j]. For *yeast* this would give the transcription *iiist*. Franklin proposed *u* for both [u] and [w]; there is no indication that he used the sound [ʊ].[6]

Modification of the vowels is proposed by Pickering through special markings (pp. 330 ff.), the cedilla being specifically suggested for the frequent nasal vowels of Indian languages. Du Ponceau is credited with the original idea, in this instance. One should not overlook, in passing, the undoubted in-

[4] Pickering, "Uniform Orthography," pp. 323-324.

[5] Benjamin Franklin, "A Scheme for a New Alphabet and Reformed Mode of Spelling." *The Works of Benjamin Franklin*, ed. Jared Sparks (Boston: Tappan & Whittemore, 1838), VI, 293-303.

[6] See C. M. Wise, "Benjamin Franklin as a Phonetician," *SM*, XV (1948), 99-120, especially p. 118.

fluence of Du Ponceau on Pickering's "Uniform Orthography." In the spring of 1820, Pickering first presented his scheme as a paper read before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences; he subsequently wrote to his friend:

> I take an opportunity of sending to you by my father a copy of my Paper on the Orthography of the Indian Languages. It is, as you know, only an application of the general principles of your excellent Essay on English Phonology, and will stand in need of much indulgence on your part. . . .[7]

Diphthongs are treated simply and logically (pp. 335-337) as merely combinations of vowel sounds and to be so represented. A convenient distinction is made by the suggestion that *iu* be used for the "long *u* in our word *pure*," with *yu* "to be used at the beginning of words."

In the case of the consonant sounds, again representation is logical and consistent. Following are the IPA symbols for the sounds in Pickering's "Table of the Alphabet" (pp. 353-354): [b], B; [p], P; [d], D; [t], T; [g], G; [k], K; [m], M; [n], N; [ŋ] (this sound is considered as a component part of certain nasal vowels); [ɲ], NY, NI; [v], V; [f], F; [ð], DH (Pickering comments (p. 338): ". . . for which our Saxon ancestors had an appropriate character . . ."); [θ], TH; [z], Z (another comment (p. 349): "In this case . . . it will be necessary for the Germans and Italians to relinquish their peculiar pronunciation . . ."); [s], S; [ʒ], ZH; [ʃ], SH; [j], Y; [h], H; [l], L; [r], R (here Pickering recognizes (p. 342) "very different degrees of force, or roughness, by different nations . . ."); [dʒ], DJ; DSH, DZH; [tʃ], TSH; [dz], DS, DZ; [ts], TS; [tz], TZ; [w], W; [ʍ], HW; [ç], KH; [x], GH; [gz], GS, GZ; [ks], KS; [kʃ], KSH; [gʒ], KSH (the only duplication in the alphabet, and included because of the actual occurrence of the two sounds in the Delaware language); [ʎ], LY, LI.

It is apparent that this "Uniform Orthography" is not only logical but practical. Pickering emphasizes this practical aspect, writing (pp. 350-351) that he had no intention of creating a "*universal* alphabet on strict philosophical principles for the use of the learned, but merely a *practical* one, to be applied to the Indian languages of North America. . . ." He freely admits that he has "intentionally omitted many sounds, which occur in the languages of Europe and other parts of the world, and numerous modification of greater or less delicacy in some of the fundamental sounds which have come under my notice." Again, this is an indication of the basically phonemic approach. Pickering strove to devise a workable alphabet, one which could be modified to meet existing language conditions. As Edgerton, writing more than a hundred years later, says of Pickering's alphabet: "[it] . . . is nothing more nor less than a start towards an international alphabet. It is, of course, crude and rudimentary when judged by modern standards. But it is highly creditable to Pickering that he saw what was needed." Edgerton adds that Pickering was "merely making a praiseworthy attempt to introduce a minimal degree of order into the dreadful confusion which had prevailed up to then, and which still makes it so hard to know what sounds those early writers were trying to represent by the letters they used."[8]

[7] Mary Orne Pickering, *op. cit.*, p. 286. The work by Du Ponceau is his *English Phonology; or, An Essay Towards an Analysis and Description of the Component Sounds of the English Language* (Philadelphia: printed for the author by Abraham Small, 1817); also, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, New Series (Philadelphia: A. Small, 1818), I, 228-264.

[8] Franklin Edgerton, "Notes on Early American Work in Linguistics," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1941), LXXXVII, 25-34, especially pp. 27-28.

Application of the "Uniform Orthography" in the area of North American Indian languages was comparatively minor. Du Ponceau reports receiving "an excellent Vocabulary of the Language of the Penobscot Indians, written and spelled according to the Pickeringian Orthography. . . ."[9] In 1820 Pickering writes: ". . . I have communicated the plan to the Revd Dr. [Samuel] Worcester (who is Secretary to the Amer. Missionary Board) & some of his coadjutors; who all express a warm interest in the subject. . . ."[10] This interest bore fruit. An anonymous writer in 1836 enumerates the number of publications in various languages by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and adds:

> . . . With the exception of those in the Cherokee . . . the works have been printed in the orthography proposed by Mr. Pickering, as a uniform method of writing the Indian languages. This we regard as a most important improvement. . . .[11]

By and large, however, the Pickering orthography never gained wide usage in writing Indian languages and today is not used.

As a matter of fact, Pickering's "Uniform Orthography" obtained its most enduring use far from Boston, the city of its origin, indeed far from the shores of the United States.

In March, 1820, the first missionaries, led by the Rev. Hiram Bingham, arrived in the Sandwich Islands, today known as the Hawaiian Islands. At first, the spelling of native words was purely by invention and imagination. "New words were hammered out by main strength in any combination of letters that seemed to a given writer to suggest an approximation of what he thought he heard," say Wise and Hervey;[12] and then they proceed to give the following account of the regularization of the Hawaiian orthography. On January 1, 1822, the missionaries received two copies of a New Zealand Grammar and Vocabulary, which confirmed them in their choice of symbols for vowel sounds. "The missionaries, greatly to their credit, had determined among themselves to use *a, e, i, o, u* with their Latin values, but it is important too that the New Zealand book confirmed them in this choice." In this same year, an English missionary, William Ellis, arrived from a six-year stay in Tahiti and neighboring islands. His arrival fell on April 7, whereas the first book had been printed on the preceding January 7. But, according to Wise and Hervey, "He had read John Pickering's work on establishing the orthography of American Indian languages." Consequently, he is presumed to have had much influence in determining the final shape of the orthography devised by the missionaries for the Hawaiian language. Wise and Hervey state that Bingham and undoubtedly others of the missionaries knew of Pickering's essay.

Actually, Bingham's contact with Pickering was earlier than the above-named writers realized. Pickering's daughter writes:

> . . . In the year 1819, when the Rev. Hiram Bingham was about setting off as the first missionary sent to the Sandwich Islands by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, he came to consult my father as to the mode of writing the unwritten dialects of those islands, and he brought with him a Hawaiian (Owhyheean) youth, Thomas Hopoo, educated at the Foreign Missionary School at

[9] Mary Orne Pickering, *op. cit.*, pp. 311-312.

[10] Thomas A. Kirby, *John Pickering and Peter S. Duponceau, A Selection of their Correspondence* (unpublished manuscript), pp. 134-135.

[11] "Preface" in *Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* (Cambridge: University Press, 1836), II, ix.

[12] C. M. Wise and Wesley Hervey, "The Evolution of Hawaiian Orthography," *QJS*, XXXVIII (October 1952), 311-325, especially p. 313.

Cornwall, Conn., with whom my father had some interviews, and from whom an idea of the sounds of his native language could be obtained. By Mr. Bingham's earnest and anxious desire, my father gave him his views advocating the adoption of the foreign sounds of the vowels, afterwards forming the basis of his Essay on the Uniform Orthography of Indian Languages, which was published in the Memoires [*sic*] of the American Academy. . . .[13]

This adoption of Pickering's orthography was a source of considerable pleasure to its author. In a letter to Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, dated January 14, 1828, he notes that he has received material via the Boston Missionary Society from the Sandwich Islands. He adds:

. . . You will see . . . that our missionaries have adopted the systematic orthography which I recommended for our American languages, and our missionaries have remarked that the native children, by means of this orthography, learned to read their language in a much shorter time than our children in the United States learn to read English. . . .[14]

There were, of course, difficulties in applying the orthography to the spoken language. In another letter to Baron von Humboldt, Pickering comments on a report from the missionaries with respect to the difficulty "in deciding upon the sounds . . . in consequence of the careless and irregular habits of speaking among the people in general."[15] Obviously, the difficulty was not always in the speech of the natives, but also in the hearing of the missionaries. As Wise and Hervey point out:

Different people found themselves hearing Hawaiian consonants in different ways. Often the same person would hear the same Hawaiian speaker pronounce the same word with different consonants. When confronted with the two pronunciations, the Hawaiian would sometimes choose one rather than the other, or would say that both sounded alike to him and that it made no difference. Merely using Latin letters uniformly for all these sounds did not help.[16]

However, the use of Pickering's orthography was without doubt a long stride ahead and was the most enduring application of that orthography.

An evaluation of Hawaiian orthography is, in a sense, an evaluation of Pickering's "Uniform Orthography," for it was devised as a practical means of writing previously unwritten languages, intended to be modified as the peculiar needs of a given language demanded. Certainly Hawaiian is one of the easiest of languages to read and write. And certainly this is due in large part to the successful application of John Pickering's principles.

[13] Mary Orne Pickering, *op. cit.*, p. 291.
[14] *Ibid.*, pp. 356-357.
[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 407-408.
[16] Wise and Hervey, pp. 315-316.

PITT, BURKE, AND FOX

I do not think the fame of Pitt very honourable to English mind; neither Pitt nor Peel. Pitt is a mediocre man, is only explained by the commanding superiority which a good debater in a town meeting has, and there is not a quotable phrase or word from him, or measure. Nothing for man. Mere parliamentary plausibility and dexterity, and the right external conditions, namely, of name, birth, breeding, and relation to persons and parties. Pitt is nothing without his victory. Burke, on the other side, who had no victory, and nothing but defeat and disparagement, is an ornament of the human race; and Fox had essential manliness. His speeches show a man, brave, generous, and sufficient, always on the right side.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals*, ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VIII, 340.

SPOKEN ENGLISH AND THE TEACHERS' CERTIFICATE IN ENGLAND

Percy J. Hitchman

THE supply of teachers for the public schools[1] of England is assured through two main channels—the training colleges (of which there are 141[2] with an annual outturn of about 10,500 students) and the university departments of education (18 in number with an outturn of 2,400). The latter provide one-year courses for university graduates in the principles and practice of education, the former, two-year or three-year courses which aim to provide training in teaching as well as a liberal education for the student—though not one which leads to a university degree. Most university graduates will aspire to teach in grammar schools (selective schools with the traditional academic subject-dominated curriculum for the top 15% or so of the total school population aged 11 and over); the students from the training colleges will, in most cases, teach either in primary schools (i.e., nursery, infant, or junior schools taking children up to age 11) or in secondary "modern" schools (which cater to the bulk of the school population over the age of 11 and provide for them a less formal, less academic type of schooling than that given in the grammar schools).[3]

During the last thirty years there have been two major reconstructions of the supervisory machinery of teacher-training. Up to the year 1926, the syllabuses for the various subjects and activities (both cultural and professional) in teacher-training were issued, and the examinations, upon the result of which was awarded the Teachers' Certificate, were conducted, by the government Board of Education (or by its nineteenth-century predecessors). An important practical outcome of the 1925 government report on the training of teachers[4] was the setting up of the Delegacies, joint boards composed of members of regionally-grouped colleges, a local university, and Board of Education assessors, which took over the Teachers' Certificate system from the government Board. For about twenty years, 1927-1947, these University Delegacies instituted the Regulations, approved the syllabuses, and conducted the examinations of the several new regional Teachers' Certificates which took the place of the single Board of Education Certificate. A comparable result of

Percy J. Hitchman (B.A., London University, M.Ed., The University of Nottingham) holds the L.R.A.M. diploma (Licentiate of the Royal Academy of Music) in Speech and Drama, and is lecturer in Spoken English at The University of Nottingham.

[1] In the American sense, not the English.

[2] Included (for convenience) in this total are the ten Colleges of Art and the three Technical Training Colleges which provide a one-year teacher-training course for those who already possess specialist qualifications.

[3] But many university graduates are to be found in secondary modern schools and other non-academic types of secondary school; and some non-graduate specialist teachers of such subjects as art, domestic science, physical training, arts and crafts, who have been trained in the two-year or three-year colleges, teach in grammar schools.

[4] Report of the Departmental Committee on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, H.M.S.O. 1925.

the McNair Report, 1944,[5] was the setting up of the regional Institutes of Education, which have brought the training colleges into a much more intimate relationship with their area universities and with each other.

Less than twenty years separate these reports, but during that time a revolution has taken place in the attitude of Authority towards voice and speech in the training of teachers.

The 1925 Report made no mention of voice or speech as teaching tools or as instruments for the education of teachers. There are several references to art, music, handwork. In the "natural qualities desirable" in intending teachers "some capacity for drawing, music and handwork is very important, if not essential."[6] "Art, music and handwork —they are subjects of great importance in elementary schools."[7] The Report stresses the traditional and continuing working-class origin of teachers but gives no suggestion of awareness that the voice and speech usually associated with the working-classes might need attention in teacher-training.

As late as 1934 Clarissa Bell, lecturer in English Method (with the care of speech-training) in a university department of Education, investigating attitudes towards good speech, could report: "It would thus appear that little importance is attached to the speech of intending teachers by those responsible for planning the courses and examinations for the Teacher's Diploma and Teacher's Certificate, and no provision is made for the refusal of a pass certificate to students on the score of bad speech. While it is well known that in many training colleges prominence is given to the matter of good speech and provision made for the study of speech-training, it is clear that little interest may be expected from students in problems of speech generally, and in their own mode of speech particularly, until the importance of the matter has been given some official recognition by the bodies responsible for the regulations governing the courses of study followed in training colleges."[8]

Twenty years later the official view has been revolutionized. Under the heading, "Professional Subjects," the McNair Report says: "The essential requirements of all teachers are (a) some mastery of their own language and the power of clear speech, (b) a grounding in the fundamental principles of education, and (c) competence in the art of teaching."[9]

"English is everyone's business, and a teacher, no matter what his subject, who is not incidentally training his pupils in a mastery of the English language is a failure. All members of the staff of a training institution should insist on students speaking and writing clearly."[10]

Two important points must be noted here. The first is that ability in speech and language is regarded as the prime essential in a teacher; the second, that this ability is not the concern only of a specialist but of the whole staff.

"Language," says the Report, "is the instrument through which teachers both teach and educate. Unless a teacher has

[5] Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders, H.M.S.O. 1944. (Reports of Departmental Committees set up by the Government are often called briefly after the name of the chairman; in this case Sir Arnold McNair.)

[6] Board of Education Report on the Training of Teachers for Public Elementary Schools, 1925, p. 55.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 83.

[8] C. C. Bell, "An investigation of the attitude of training college students towards the importance of good speech" (M.A. thesis, London, 1934).

[9] McNair Committee Report, 1944, p. 66.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

at least a moderate competence in reading, writing, speaking and listening he is hampered at every turn. This competence is far from being acquired in the secondary schools."[11]

The complaint that intending teachers are ill-equipped by their schools is an old one. Over a hundred years earlier James Kay-Shuttleworth had complained of the speaking and reading of newly-arrived students.[12] The Principal of St. Mark's, Chelsea, said in 1846 of the pupils recommended to him for training, "They cannot read well, that is with intelligence";[13] and Her Majesty's Inspector, reporting on the York and Ripon Training Institution in 1849, said, "The attainments of the students generally admitted are very low."[14] It was a constant theme of Her Majesty's Inspector, the Reverend Cowie, in the late 50's and early 60's that the schools and the masters to whom the pupil-teachers were apprenticed were not doing their work in training students in speech and reading so that much extra labor was thrown on the training colleges.

The McNair Report quotes the Norwood Report of 1943 as saying that there was a serious failure in the secondary schools in training pupils to think clearly and to express themselves lucidly on paper or in speech; they were often at a loss in communicating what they wished to communicate "in clear and simple sentences and in expressive and audible tone."[15]

Since it is, generally speaking, not the most able of the grammar school pupils who enter training colleges, it is clear that much work in voice and speech that the Norwood Report considers should be done in the schools must, in fact, be done in the training colleges.

In the past the term "speech training" has largely meant voice-training. Indeed, there are today many teachers of elocution who still, in the daily practice of their skill, so regard it. "Speech training" has less often been regarded as training in the use of spoken language. Manner has often been considered as more important than matter.

The McNair Report quite clearly regards training in the manipulation of language, as well as training in voice, as being part of teacher-training. "Three things are involved," it says; "clear and, if possible, pleasant speech; the power to say and write what one means; and the capacity to direct one's understanding to what other people say and write."[16]

This is an admirable definition of the ends to which training in Spoken English should be directed. It comprehends training in the production of a pleasant vocal tone, of a readily understood pronunciation that does not draw the attention away from what is being said, of an intonation range conventional yet lively, and training in the capacity to use Spoken English effectively.

A good speaking voice is a valuable asset to the teacher as a teacher. "Children are sensitive to the quality of a teacher's voice," says the Report, "and even though they may not give it any conscious attention, it not only influences their own manner of speaking, it also directly affects a teacher's ability to manage children happily." The Report adds: "There are few students who will

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

[12] Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1842-43, p. 216. (First Report on the Training School at Battersea, 1841).

[13] Thirty-third Annual Report of the National Society, 1844, p. 35. (A Second Letter on the National Society's Training Institution for Schoolmasters, 1844).

[14] Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education, 1848-50, p. 698. (Report on the York and Ripon Training Institution for Females, 1849).

[15] McNair Committee Report, 1944, p. 66.

[16] *Ibid.*, p. 66.

not need some help in the use of their voice and advice about their manner of speech. There are some who will need definite therapeutic training and for such it should be compulsorily prescribed."[17]

"Training and practice can improve powers of lucid expression," but the Report does not expect from students "an impeccable standard of taste in written and spoken English." "What we urge is that every student should be trained to acquire a sufficient mastery of his own language to enable him to use it as an effective instrument for his own education and for that of his future pupils."[18]

In the matter of speech the Report made specific recommendations:
(a) that the Board of Education should require every training institution to pay attention to the speech of every student, and every area training authority to include in the assessment of a student's practical teaching his ability to use the English language; and (b) that the Board of Education should require every training institution to make arrangements for the detection of speech disabilities and for the provision of speech therapy and training where necessary.[19]

It can safely be said that, with the maturing of the Report, all these specific recommendations are now a part of general teacher-training practice.[20] All training institutions have at least one lecturer on their permanent or part-time visiting staffs charged with the care of voice and speech. In some cases these lecturers devote their whole time to Spoken English activities. More than half of them are trained speech specialists. Lively and effective attention is paid to the speech of every student, and where therapy is needed, it is provided either in the college or at the speech clinic of the local government health authority. Every training institution watches carefully the standard of voice, speech, and language of its students.

The standard of each student is assessed in the Teachers' Certificate examination in several ways: (a) in all colleges the standard of usage of Spoken English is reflected in the final Teaching Mark awarded by the examiners; (b) some area training authorities require college principals to certify that their candidates have reached a satisfactory standard of voice and speech, the method of assessment being left to the colleges; (c) some area training authorities arrange for external examiners (in collaboration with internal college assessors) to conduct tests in Spoken English in their colleges, failure in which denies a candidate a Teacher's Certificate until he has satisfied the authorities at a later examination of his proficiency in Spoken English. (This means that an unsuccessful candidate must teach, for at least a year, "unqualified," i.e., at a lower salary than if he had been awarded his Certificate.)

The area training authorities, the creation of which was one of the recommendations of the McNair Report, have been set up during the last ten years. There are now sixteen of them in England, and it is possible that the University College of North Staffordshire may provide the nucleus of a seventeenth. All are placed in an examination relationship with a smaller or greater number of training colleges and university departments of education, ranging from two colleges and one department

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 66.
[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[20] A full account of the training in spoken English given to intending teachers in England is given by Percy J. Hitchman, "A Critical Enquiry into the training in Spoken English given to intending teachers in training colleges and university departments of Education" (M.Ed. thesis, Nottingham, 1954).

each in the case of the Institutes of Education of the Universities of Reading and Hull and of the University of the South West to thirty-seven Colleges and two departments in the case of the University of London Institute of Education. All area training authorities are known as Institutes of Education except the Manchester School of Education.

Each Institute has a director, a staff, and a headquarters, approves the constituent colleges' courses and syllabuses, and is responsible for its Teachers' Certificate examination and for the recommendation of successful students to the Ministry of Education for the status of qualified teacher. It must be emphasised that the Institute—as far as its academic responsibilities extend with regard to the training of teachers—is a corporate body composed of its constituent colleges and departments, and it is the representatives of these training institutions sitting with representatives of the university in the various "subject" committees who decide Institute policy on a particular subject and approve the curricula of its members. While this general approval is necessary, each college is responsible for its own courses and syllabuses. This is as true of Spoken English as it is of Mathematics or History. Where there is a general requirement of all colleges in a particular Institute in any given subject, this derives from the collective decision of representatives of the Constituent Colleges and departments sitting as a committee of that Institute.

The sixteen area training authorities show considerable variety of requirement in Spoken English in connection with their Certificates in Education.

The following eleven Institutes make no specific requirements in Spoken English:

University of Birmingham	(comprising 13 colleges)
University of Bristol	(comprising 10 colleges)
Cambridge	(comprising 10 colleges)
University of the South West	(comprising 2 colleges)
University of Hull	(comprising 2 colleges)
University of Leeds	(comprising 11 colleges)
University College of Leicester	(comprising 3 colleges)
University of Liverpool	(comprising 10 colleges)
University of Oxford	(comprising 3 colleges)
University of Reading	(comprising 2 colleges)
Manchester School of Education	(comprising 9 colleges)

The general view of this group is that the question of standards in Spoken English can be left to the individual colleges. It is important to note, however, that the teaching-practice examination (which is, of course, a part of the examination for the Certificate in Education of all Institutes) is in the nature of a test in voice, speech, and language, and that some weight will be given to proficiency in Spoken English.

These eleven Institutes, which make no specific requirement in Spoken English, cover about half the colleges in England, 75 out of 141. What of the other five Institutes?

The University of Southampton Institute of Education (comprising 6 colleges), has no examination in Spoken English. Any student who is reported as having passed in Section 1 of the Certificate Examination (which includes English, i.e., "the written and spoken word"), assessed internally, is deemed to have reached a satisfactory standard in Spoken English.

The University of Sheffield Institute of Education (comprising 7 colleges), requires all candidates other than those offering English Language and Literature to show that they have reached a satisfactory standard in Written and Spoken English. The Institute has not

laid down any form of examination for these two latter subjects, but each college Principal has to certify that students have reached a satisfactory standard in them.

The University of London Institute of Education (comprising 37 colleges), requires that, before a student can enter for the Teachers' Certificate examination, he has to submit to the Institute a signed statement certifying, amongst other things, that the college authorities are satisfied with his Spoken and Written English, and that he has satisfied them in a suitable range of curriculum studies.

It is possible that a college may have a student who has just failed in Spoken or Written English or a curriculum subject. He will be "referred" and will teach for one year as an unqualified teacher before being examined again in his curriculum subject or assessed in Spoken or Written English. In Spoken English there have been as yet only five years' performance, 1951-55, and no one has failed to reach the standard set by his college. A student's being certified as satisfactory or being "referred" are college responsibilities.

Each student in this Institute has to pursue a course in a "Special Field of Study," and is examined by the Institute in this subject, though not in its teaching method. The Institute considers that a training college student should really be a student; i.e., he should follow a course of study of his own preference at an adult level. This is his "Special Field," and he gives a great deal of time to it. In 1954 and 1955 eight colleges (seven for women and one for men and women) offered courses in Drama, English and Drama, or Speech and Drama as special fields of study. (In 1956 nine colleges will do so). Subjects in these fields are examined by external examiners in oral or practical work in addition to two of the following: a special study and/or course work; dramatic production and/or group work in drama; and a written paper.

The University of Durham Institute of Education (comprising ten colleges), is one of the two Institutes of Education which have an Oral English test in connection with their Certificate examinations.

A pass in this oral test is necessary for a pass in English as a whole. As English is a compulsory element in the Certificate examination, any student failing in Oral English is denied a teaching certificate and must teach unqualified for at least a year; to qualify he or she must take the oral examination again and pass it.

All students are assessed by the internal examiners. Marking is standardized by the presentation to an external examiner of a representative sample of the candidates (usually between a quarter and a third).

The compulsory test is held during the second year (in February for some colleges, in June for the remainder) and comprises the following parts: (a) either a prepared speech (of two minutes' duration) or the taking of a part in a scene or play (choice of play and role to be approved by the internal examiner), or the telling of a story (candidates to state the age of their supposed audience); (b) a prepared verse-speaking from a list of poems selected by either the candidate or the internal examiner; (c) an unprepared prose reading.

The University of Nottingham Institute of Education (comprising six colleges), also has an oral test in connection with its Certificate examination. It takes two forms, a Basic Test compulsory for those students whom the Principal of a college cannot confidently recommend as having reached an ap-

proved standard in Spoken English (a standard the lowest compatible with efficiency in teaching), and a Voluntary Test (at an advanced level) for those with good speech who would like to have it certified in their testimonials that they have reached the advanced standard.

The requirements in the Basic Test for 1955 were: (a) the reading aloud of a prepared passage of prose; (b) the reading aloud of an unseen passage of prose; (c) conversation with an external examiner on general topics or special interests.

Failure in the Basic Test means that a student must teach "unqualified" for at least a year; to "qualify" the student must take the oral examination again and pass it.

The Voluntary Test comprised in 1955: (a) reading aloud (or reciting from memory) a prepared passage of verse, and *either* (i) a prepared speech from a play, *or* (ii) a story of not more than five minutes' duration; (b) reading aloud an unseen passage of prose; (c) *either* (i) questions by the examiner demanding continuous exposition in reply, *or* (ii) a speech lasting from two to three minutes (the subject of the speech to be selected by the examiner from a list of three or four topics known to the candidate, who will then be given three minutes to prepare his remarks).

It will be seen that while every area training authority has a final teaching practice examination the assessment of which must inevitably include consideration of the candidate's use of voice, speech, and language, only two Institutes, Durham and Nottingham, have, as parts of the examination for the Certificate in Education, special compulsory tests in Spoken English, assessed by external examiners, failure in which means denial of the status of qualified teacher.

OLD-TIME POLITICAL SPEECHES

In the early seventies, when I was a very small boy, there was a Republican gathering in our Republican grove. The speaker was a well-known politician of the period and a typical post-war stump-speaker, who grew more furious at "the rebels" as the war receded in time.

Long, thick, inky-black hair flowed over his collar, and immense black mustaches added to his formidable and ferocious appearance. The August sun made the surrounding prairies shimmer with heat and even in the shade of the trees men mopped their brows, women fanned crying babies, and all were as uncomfortable as they were enthusiastic.

I sat between my parents on the front plank which, at either end and in the middle, rested on logs. The speaker, escorted by the committee, mounted the flag-draped platform, was introduced, threw off his coat and vest, tore his collar and tie from his neck, replaced them with a red bandanna handkerchief which made him look more militant than ever, ran his fingers through his mane and began:

"Comrades! And you, the mothers, wives, and sweethearts of my comrades! Who murdered our comrades? Rebels! Democrats!" (Tremendous cheering. A voice "Give 'm hell, John." More cheering.) "Who tried to shoot the Stars and Stripes from the heavens? Rebels! Democrats!" So the orator in a crimson torrent raged on, waving the flag, pounding the table, gesticulating wildly, shaking his head like an infuriated bull and working himself up to boiling heat, physically as well as emotionally. At last came a picturesque and blood-curdling climax.

It was a great speech everybody said. . . .

Albert J. Beveridge, *The Art of Public Speaking* (Boston and New York, 1924), pp. 5-7.

PHILIP BARRY AND HIS SOCIO-POLITICAL ATTITUDES

Monroe Lippman

PHILIP BARRY is not chiefly concerned with the presentation of a socio-political viewpoint, as is frequently considered to be the case with such dramatists as Lillian Hellman and Clifford Odets. He has written only one play in which the major theme is primarily based on a political, social, or economic issue. But there are others of his works in which he does disclose such a viewpoint by evincing definite critical attitudes toward certain social or political phenomena, even though the presentation of his viewpoint may not be essential to the major theme of the play in which it occurs. In several of his earlier plays his favorite target is Business (with a capital B), and in some of his later works it is fascism as a threat to democracy.

Barry's attitude toward Business is first revealed in his earliest produced play, *You and I* (1923), where the attitude is one of amused tolerance. Any allusions to Business and its practices are oblique rather than direct, but there is no mistaking the fact that Barry looks upon the average successful Big Business man with something approaching contempt. G. T. Warren, the big business man in *You and I*, is not malicious; on the contrary, he is a warm, expansive, not unlikable Babbitt. But he is a man with no intellectual or cultural interests, whose entire life revolves around his business, and whose judgment of a serious piece of painting is based entirely upon the wide popular appeal he senses in it, and upon its consequent value as an advertising medium which might stimulate increased sales of the soap he manufactures. Although we cannot dislike Warren, he comes off very poorly in contrast to the other major characters in the play: Maitland White, an artist turned business man, and his wife; Ricky, his son, who is planning to study architecture; Ronny, his son's fiancée; and Geoffrey Nichols, a friend who is a writer—all people with an awareness of and interest in things beyond the realm of commerce.

In his next play, *The Youngest* (1924), Barry manifests a somewhat sharper distaste for Business, although this is neither a play about that subject nor a play of social criticism. Rather, it is the story of the youngest in the family, a potential writer, rebelling against his elders in a fight for the right to live his life as he wishes. But in a sense, perhaps Business might be considered the antagonist, for the young hero's elders wish him to devote his life to the family business, a pin factory which has been the basis of the family's position as the social and industrial leaders of the community. Here again the representatives of Business are portrayed as stuffy people, concerned with nothing but their own affairs, and completely scornful of such dubious tastes as an appreciation of literature and a desire to write.

Barry's disdainful attitude toward

Monroe Lippman (Ph.D., Michigan, 1937) is Professor of Theatre and Speech and Head of his Department at Tulane University. During this present academic year he holds a Guggenheim Fellowship for historical studies of American plays of protest.

these representatives of Business is expressed through his young protagonist, Richard Winslow. "Industrial Progress —more business—bigger and better business," scoffs Richard, "Agh! 'S if there wasn't too much business already." Again, while addressing the employees of the pin factory in a Fourth-of-July address normally made by the oldest brother, Richard says, to the dismay of his elders, "What the world needs is more leisure 'n' fewer alarm-clocks—less do-as-you're told 'n' more do-as-you-please." And again, deviating from the usual theme of the traditional Fourth-of-July tribute to Business, young Richard expresses his (and Barry's) iconoclastic views in very clear terms:

> . . . to be different doesn't mean to be inferior. There's no such thing as inferiority, anyway, neither in individuals, nor in towns, nor in nations. . . . Being different. *That's* what makes life *worth living!* America's kept *her* individuality—Where'd she be if she hadn't? Let's keep ours! And let's see this inferiority thing as the myth it is—a myth invented by tyrants—to make *themselves superior!* And oh, my *dear* fellow-citizens, if any of *you* ever feels it, mind you treat it as young America did: *declare* yourself—equal—free—independent!

If these words seem tame in comparison to the language of such later protest playwrights as Clifford Odets, Irwin Shaw, or the Maxwell Anderson of *Both Your Houses,* let it be remembered that they were written at a time when the prevalent attitude toward Big Business was primarily one of respect. Also, it was a time of general prosperity, and consequently there was not a great deal of serious social protest to be seen on the American stage. In fact, the only genuine protest plays of the entire season of which *The Youngest* was a part were *What Price Glory* and *Processional,* both of which directed their condemnation at institutions and practices less popular in the public mind than was Big Business.

Although at least one Barry play was produced in each of the seasons intervening between 1924 and 1928, it was not until that latter season that he again gave us a play in which there is a strong element of social criticism. The play was the highly successful comedy, *Holiday,* and again the target was Business. *Holiday* opened in late November, 1928, just eleven months before that fateful day in 1929 when the stock market crashed with a force that shook the world. During the season of *Holiday* the big boom was still on; money was still America's god, and anyone who possessed it in sufficient quantity was to be admired, especially if he had acquired it through such respectable channels as Big Business.

Edward Seton, the Big Business man in *Holiday,* is definitely a less likable person than G. T. Warren, his predecessor in *You and I.* He is successful, pompous, cold, cocksure, and imbued with a reverence for riches. When informed of his prospective son-in-law's lack of interest in making too much money, Edward is stunned, but recovering his equilibrium, says bewilderedly, "Too *much* money?" It is clear that to Edward Seton and all other right-thinking men there simply is no such thing. This attitude is shared by his older daughter, who assures her fiancé that "there's no such thrill in the world as making money."

When Johnny Case, the young man in question, presents his scheme to make just enough money to retire and enjoy it till it's gone, and then work when he's older, Edward recoils at the thought that there is a red-blooded man alive who doesn't want to make enough to enable him, as his younger daughter satirically puts it, to live well "on the income of his income." This entire attitude of Johnny's, his unwillingness to

devote his life exclusively to piling up money, is characterized angrily by Edward as "deliberately un-American," and there is little doubt that if there had been an un-American activities committee at the time, Edward would have reported Johnny as being subversive of the American system of free enterprise.

In the ten years following the season of *Holiday*, six Barry plays were seen on Broadway, but it was 1938 before Barry again concerned himself with criticism of the existing order. By this time he was through with Business as a target, for times had changed, and there were other more immediate problems. Nineteen thirty-eight, it will be remembered, was the year when Hitler marched into Austria and made it a part of greater Germany; it was the year of the Munich agreement which brought Czechoslovakia's Sudetenland under the rule of the Third Reich; it was the year in which many people in this country were forced to realize that the titanic struggle between democracy and fascism had in fact begun, although the outbreak of the great war was still a year off. Such American playwrights as Maxwell Anderson, Elmer Rice, Kaufman and Hart, and Robert E. Sherwood showed their concern with the problem during this season in such plays as *Knickerbocker Holiday*, *American Landscape*, *The American Way*, and *Abe Lincoln in Illinois*. Barry's awareness was revealed in the somewhat obscure fantasy, *Here Come the Clowns*.

Although this play met with general critical approval, there was some bewilderment on the part of critics and audiences alike as to its meaning. The action occurs in a cafe in back of a vaudeville theatre named the Globe because it represents, according to Barry, a "small cross-section of the world." Occupying the cafe at various times during the action of the play are such performers as a ventriloquist and his Lesbian wife, a song-and-dance team, a midget, and others. Into their midst comes a Mr. Pabst, a somewhat Freudian illusionist with a central European accent who, by persistently and maliciously prying into the innermost problems and worries of these people, succeeds in ruining their lives. Just before meeting his death, Clancy, a bewildered stagehand who is Barry's protagonist in search of Truth, turns on the illusionist with this revelation: "I see now it's no will of God things are as they are—no, nor Devil's will neither! It's the will of all them like yourself, the world over—men bad by their *own choice*—and the woods full of 'em!"

If the application of Barry's play to the then-current problems of the world is not readily apparent from the script (as it is not to this writer), at least we have the playwright's word that it was intended to be, for in an article which Barry wrote for the New York *World Telegram* of December 10, 1938, just three days after the play's opening, the playwright stated, for the benefit of those who had failed to grasp its meaning, that it was concerned with the battle with evil being fought throughout the world. He further clarified his viewpoint by saying that "it is infinitely better to die in this struggle than it is to live in fear or in the questionable security which follows any compromise with all these things in government and human society that we know in our hearts to be wrong." That Barry felt it necessary thus to explain the meaning of his play seems to indicate that his first effort to deal directly with an international political issue was not eminently successful.

It was over two years before Barry again turned to protest, this time with *Liberty Jones*, an allegorical play with

music. When this play opened in February, 1941, World War II was in its seventeenth month; Germany had occupied France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway; the British had been driven from the continent at Dunkirk, and England had undergone the Battle of Britain, suffering terrible destruction by the Luftwaffe in preparation for the Nazi invasion of England which never materialized. In the United States, the nation's first peacetime draft had gone into effect, reserve units had been called up, and there was steadily increasing tension. Although it was still ten months before the attack on Pearl Harbor, the feeling that we should take our stand against fascism was being shared by an increasing number of Americans, among whom was Barry, whose sentiments are evident in *Liberty Jones.* Of all Barry's plays, this is the only one which can accurately be considered a protest play, for it is the only one in which the playwright projects through his major theme a definite point of view on a political, economic, or social issue; and in this case, since the play concerns the struggle between fascism and democracy, all three of these issues are involved.

As the play opens, we are introduced to Miss Liberty Jones, a young girl who lies in bed afflicted with what is feared to be a fatal illness. Her Uncle Samuel is much too busy directing his vast industrial empire in the manufacture of "needlesses" to be sufficiently concerned with the state of health of his niece; her Aunt Gloria is too occupied with numerous matters of only superficial importance to heed adequately the girl's condition. Hence, largely because of neglect, Miss Liberty appears to be on her death bed, although she herself is not quite willing to give up. When informed that she is merely an idea to the people and consequently is dying, she replies with some fervor: "I'm *not* just an idea, a word in a book, a far-away dream, a long-ago memory. . . . A girl is what I am—and their own girl! Theirs for every day in the week . . . and I shan't die yet. . . ." When asked what it is she wants, she says, "I should like to speak my mind freely. . . . Pray my own prayers. . . . When I sleep, sleep in peace"—a reaffirmation of our basic rights.

Despite Miss Liberty's determination to survive, however, her recovery seems dubious, because people generally have become indifferent to her condition and have grown unaware of the danger to her; in short, they have been so busy with their own business and social affairs that they have forgotten all about Liberty and are doing nothing to keep her alive. Furthermore, they are somewhat cowed by three unctuous villains labeled the Three Shirts, a name derived from the fact that in 1938 uniforms identified by the color of their shirts were not unpopular among people of a certain political persuasion: the Italian fascists were commonly identified as the Black Shirts, the German fascists as the Brown Shirts, and at least one group of American fascists as the Silver Shirts. The Three Shirts of Barry's play are city slickers, persuasive and outwardly chivalrous. They are seemingly reasonable in their demands, and willing to discuss differences of opinion; but it is no surprise to learn that their apparently reasonable demands are merely the prelude to further and less reasonable demands, and their willingness to discuss differences of opinion leads to such discussion strictly on their own terms.

Increasing the general lethargy and adding to the confusion are certain internal problems: the violent disagreement between the CIO and the AFL, symbolized when Barry introduces "Mr.

John L. Green—Mr. William Lewis"; the disrupting influence of the American communist party, represented by "Mr. Browl Erder and Fellow Travelers." It is obvious that any resemblance to existing persons or organizations is purely intentional!

Miss Liberty is finally saved by a couple of young Americans who are gradually awakened to a realization of the menace of the Three Shirts and the equal menace of their conscious or unwitting American aides. With this realization comes a willing acceptance of their responsibilities to Miss Liberty, and the consequent defeat of the Three Shirts. Although some found this allegory diffuse and confusing, subtlety is not one of its virtues. The playwright's three-fold message is clear and unmistakable: first, that we must not be frightened or deceived into submitting to fascism; second, that there can be no compromise with fascism, that it must be fought to destruction; third, that we must not lose our own principles in the fight against the fascists—that we must fight our way, not theirs, so that we do not lose our freedoms while fighting for them.

If this only protest play of Barry's is one of his less successful works, it is perhaps because of three major faults: his characters are pallid and unreal, even for a musical allegory; his usual bright and entertaining dialogue is missing; the treatment of theme degenerates into rather dull propaganda. In comparison with certain other plays which treat of the same general theme, such as *Watch on the Rhine, Thunder Rock,* and *The Gentle People,* it is not difficult to understand why *Liberty Jones,* labeled by Barry as being "for city children," did not appeal greatly to city adults.

In only one more play did Barry manifest a strong interest in a national or international problem. This play, *Without Love,* reverts to the formula of such earlier works as *The Youngest* and *Holiday.* Primarily, it is a comedy built around the romance of two highly engaging people, but a current political issue is considered in a sort of secondary story. The action of *Without Love* occurs in 1940 and 1941, although, when the play actually took the stage in November, 1942, we had already been in the war for nearly a year. A major concern during the time in which the play is set was the fear that Germany would try to reach England by an invasion of Eire, which was stubbornly maintaining its neutrality despite pressure to allow England to establish air bases in Ireland, in order to be able to fight off a possible invasion. It was this situation which Barry used as a sort of minor theme in *Without Love.* Patrick Jamieson, the hero, who describes himself as "a reformed economist just out of Europe—with a sudden new sense of human relationships," has just returned to America after a long stay in Europe. Since his father has been the American minister to Ireland, Pat has lived in that country for many years. Appreciating the problems involved in trying to get Ireland and England together, and believing it imperative in view of world conditions, Pat hopes that he, with his special background, can urge his own country to intercede and perhaps somehow force an agreement between England and Ireland, and thus take one more important precaution against invasion by the Nazis. The issue is not resolved in the play—perhaps it couldn't be, since it dealt with current factual matters that had not been resolved in real life—but we are given to believe that an earnest effort will be made to arrive at a helpful solution.

From the standpoint of dramaturgy, it is not vitally important that the issue involving Ireland fails to be resolved. If this were a true protest play, the issue would be of major importance; but in this play, although the introduction of the issue lends a strong feeling of timeliness and indicates Barry's awareness of a live political problem, it is not the major concern. Hence the somewhat nebulous disposal of the problem is acceptable if not completely satisfactory, for it does not interfere with the play's major conflict and the resolution of that conflict in the romantic culmination of a marriage of convenience, which had been originally planned "without love."

In all the plays considered here, except *Liberty Jones,* Barry's social or political viewpoints are secondary, if not incidental. They permit him to indicate his own attitude toward the problems involved, and they sometimes give the plays a quality of contemporaneity. Aside from this, they are not basically important to structure, at least as far as major themes are concerned, although they may sometimes serve as a factor in the plots. In view of the lack of success of his one protest play, it is perhaps well that Barry did not usually attempt plays of protest, but was content to approach obliquely whatever criticism of the political, social, or economic scene he might choose to present.

INGERSOLL

Not until my twentieth year did I have an opportunity to hear a real orator, a master of the art; and that event confirmed the soundness of the theory set out above. In a Middle-Western town where I then chanced to be—I was a book agent that summer—Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll delivered one of his celebrated lectures. In every respect he was the reverse of the stump-speakers described at the beginning of this paper.

In the first place he was perfectly attired, freshly shaved, well groomed, neatly turned out in every particular. He came to the front of the platform in the most natural manner and, looking us in the eye in a friendly fashion, began to talk to us as if he were conversing with each of us personally.

He stood still, made no gestures for a long time, and when they came at last, they were, seemingly, so spontaneous and unstudied that we scarcely noticed them, so much a part of his spoken word did they appear to be. His gestures added to the force of his remarks. Only once did he show emotion, and then it was so appropriate, so obviously sincere, gestures so well expressing the physical reaction of his sentiments, that even this outburst was engaging.

In short, everything about Colonel Ingersoll was pleasing, nothing was repellent—a prime requisite to the winning of a cordial hearing from any audience big or little, rough or polite. Even the lilt of his rhetoric was made attractive; and be it said, in passing, that his blank-verse style was the only thing in the oratory of Colonel Ingersoll the good taste of which might, perhaps, be open to criticism.

At any rate, considered exclusively from the point of view of oratory as an art and without reference to his opinions, Ingersoll was one of the four greatest public speakers America has produced—that is, one of the four greatest artists. If we are to credit tradition, the others were Daniel Webster, Wendell Phillips, and Patrick Henry. Of course there have been many others, but these four are the outstanding masters.

Albert J. Beveridge, *The Art of Public Speaking* (Boston and New York, 1924), pp. 11-13.

HENRY M. ROBERT AS A PRESIDING OFFICER

Joseph F. O'Brien

HENRY M. ROBERT'S *Rules of Order* has outsold such popular fiction favorites as Edgar Rice Burroughs' *Tarzan of the Apes*, Alice Hegan Rice's *Mrs. Wiggs of the Cabbage Patch*, and Frances Hodgson Burnett's *Little Lord Fauntleroy*.

The Robert manual does not outsell all fiction, of course. For example, Margaret Mitchell's *Gone With the Wind* runs far ahead. Nor does the Robert manual outsell all nonfiction. It is far outsold by the best of all best sellers, the Bible, and Henry M. Robert would say that this is as it should be. It is also outdistanced by such works as Dale Carnegie's *How to Win Friends and Influence People* and Fannie Farmer's *Boston Cookbook*. But the parliamentary handbook does outsell Emily Post's *Etiquette* and even that old favorite, Reed's *Land Birds East of the Rockies*.

With remarkable appropriateness, the Robert manual was first published in 1876, the centennial year of the Declaration of Independence. It had sold over 1,500,000 copies by 1950, and had the best year of its history in 1955 with over 63,000 copies marketed by November 1. These figures place the brown-covered manual on almost any list of nonfiction best sellers of all time. It may therefore be of some interest to ask the question, "What kind of a presiding officer was Robert himself?"

Robert brought a unique qualification to his task of serving as moderator to the millions: unlike previous important American parliamentarians, such as Thomas Jefferson and Luther S. Cushing, he was not a legislative parliamentarian by experience but looked at meetings the way the layman did. His *Rules* did come to be widely used in legislative assemblies. But Robert himself never held an elective public office. He was an army engineer who serviced rivers and harbors up and down the nation for over forty years. He was also an active church worker, much interested in societies devoted to human welfare, and an organizer of adult education groups such as mutual interest societies and reading circles. A careful analyst of congressional procedure, it was nevertheless from his army boards of engineers, church assemblies, welfare societies, and educational groups that he drew his practical parliamentary experience.

In fact, Robert got his start in parliamentary procedure from presiding at a meeting, probably a church meeting, in New Bedford, Massachusetts, in 1863. To his surprise and alarm, he was asked to chair the meeting. He came out feeling that he had done a miserable job. He thereupon resolved to become conversant with parliamentary law.

In seeking an answer to the query concerning Robert himself as a presiding officer, we have three witnesses: what he himself says about the role of the chairman; what his record shows of his parliamentary experience; and what those who knew him best say of his methods as chairman of committees and assemblies.

Honest democracy and common sense

Joseph F. O'Brien is Professor of Speech at The Pennsylvania State University. *This article was presented in the section on American Public Address at the Convention of the Speech Association of America in Los Angeles, December 29, 1955.*

were essentials in Robert's credo for the meeting chairman. On democracy, he writes: "The great lesson for democracies to learn is for the majority to give the minority a full, free opportunity to present their side of the case, and then for the minority, having failed to win a majority to their views, gracefully to submit and to recognize the action as that of the entire organization, and cheerfully to assist in carrying it out, until they can secure its repeal."[1] He thus brings home to the layman the need to accept "liberty under the law" as a basic assumption of the parliamentary process.

Robert believed firmly in a common sense application of the rules of order. His manual is comprehensive in its treatment only to provide a procedure for the more unusual situations when they do arise.[2] But he clearly recognized that the formality of the procedure should be adapted to the group. "Some societies require a strict enforcement of parliamentary rules, while with others the best results will be obtained by being informal. It is important that the presiding officer have tact and common sense, especially with a very intelligent assembly."[3]

He also recognizes the need for qualities of true leadership in the presiding officer. "The chairman should not only be familiar with parliamentary usage . . . but he should be a man of executive ability, capable of controlling men; and it should never be forgotten, that, to control others, it is necessary to control one's self."[4]

Robert was a practicing churchman, but felt that religious bodies needed sound procedures just as much as did other groups. Indeed, he once said: ". . . the fact that an assembly is composed only of Christians does not affect the case. One can scarcely have had much experience in deliberative meetings of Christians without realizing that the best of men, having wills of their own, are liable to attempt to carry out their own views without paying sufficient respect to the rights of their opponents. . . . the writer has seen one of the ablest ministers in our denomination rule out of order a motion to adjourn, because he felt it *ought* to be out of order."[5]

Robert's deep belief in honest democracy and common sense as the *sine qua non* of effective chairmanship was drawn from years of experience. He had often served as member and chairman of army boards of engineers, church committees and assemblies, and community committees and assemblies.

His service on army boards of engineers covered twenty-nine years in time and the entire nation in geography. Between 1873 and 1902, he was a member of forty-nine such bodies. His first two boards, in 1873 and 1875, were concerned with the Willamette River Bridge at Portland, Oregon, and with dredging the Mississippi River at its mouth. His last two boards, in 1901 and 1902, were charged with construction of the sea wall at Galveston, Texas, following the tidal wave of September 8, 1900, and with supervision of the Ellis Island lines in New York harbor.[6]

Robert's contribution to the build-

[1] Henry M. Robert, *Parliamentary Law* (New York: Appleton-Century Co., 1923), p. 4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[3] Henry M. Robert, *Robert's Rules of Order Revised* (Chicago: Scott Foresman and Co., 1951), p. 292.

[4] Henry M. Robert, *Pocket Manual of Rules of Order* (Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Co., 1878), pp. 104-105.

[5] Henry M. Robert, "Suggestions for Parliamentary Law in Baptist Churches," n. d., in Henry M. Robert MSS, Library of Congress.

[6] *Centennial of the United States Military Academy at West Point, New York, 1802-1902* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1904), II, 191-206. Cited below as *Centennial of the United States Military Academy.*

ing of the Galveston Sea Wall brought him a signal honor. A Liberty ship built by the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation was christened the "Henry M. Robert" during World War II. In the citation, Colonel J. H. Anderson of the Corps of Engineers credits General Robert and his Board with the report that "became the basis for the construction of all the engineering works which today protect Galveston from a recurrence of that terrible disaster of 1900."[7]

While in New York, Robert made a worthy contribution to human tolerance. He secured the consent of the War Department to hire a woman clerk, the first one ever employed in that agency's New York office.[8]

The engineer boards on which Robert served numbered from one to seven members. The two one-member boards were each composed of Henry M. Robert. They were entrusted with the improvement of Philadelphia Harbor in 1888, and of the mouth of the Brazos River in Texas in 1899.

Robert was president of thirty-three of these boards of engineers. He served more often in this capacity than did any other officer except Col. J. N. Macomb, who held the position thirty-five times.[9] Robert reports that he always came out with a unanimous decision.

Robert's experience in church and community groups was even more extensive than that on army boards of engineers. In San Francisco in 1870 he was averaging 1.7 meetings a week. His box score for the nine months from March 1 to December 4 showed fifty-three committee meetings and twenty assembly sessions, as follows:[10]

Organization	Committee	Assembly
Society for the Rescue of Fallen Women (California Rescue Mission)	28	6
Congregation of First Baptist Church	8	6
Young Men's Christian Association	8	5
Chinese Sabbath School	5	2
California Baptist Educational Society	2	
California Baptist State Convention	2	1
	53	20

From the foregoing, it may be gathered that the Society for the Rescue of Fallen Women was Robert's favorite project at this time. This society tried to reclaim wayward girls by supplying them with a home and finding them jobs. Robert worked with his committees in locating prospects at all hours on Pacific Street and in the intersecting streets and alleys.

Robert sincerely believed that he was doing God's work in reclaiming San Francisco streetwalkers for useful, respectable lives. If his purpose and the name of the society now strike us as somewhat Victorian, it must be remembered that the Barbary Coast of that day offered the society an unusually rich source of raw material. Nor should the naïve suppose that all was joy for these supposedly fun-loving girls. A brutalized life and an early death were their common lot.

It is of interest that Gladstone, Prime Minister of Great Britain, was carrying on work for the rescue of fallen women in London at the same time that Robert organized his society in San Francisco. Like Robert, Gladstone was convinced

[7] "Address of Lt. Col. J. H. Anderson at the Launching of the S. S. 'Henry M. Robert'," MS., n. d., collection of Mrs. Corinne R. Redgrave, daughter of General Robert.

[8] Memorandum from Mrs. Corinne R. Redgrave, November 19, 1955.

[9] *Centennial of the United States Military Academy*, II, 191-206.

[10] Henry M. Robert, "San Francisco Diary, 1870," collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

that in trying to redeem his fallen sisters he was doing the work of the Lord.[11]

In most of his San Francisco organizations, Robert was in a key position. He was the treasurer and the moving spirit of the Society for the Rescue of Fallen Women, chairman of the Chinese Sabbath School Committee, a member of the Board of Trustees of the Baptist Educational Society, and chairman of the church assembly that elected the deacons for the year.[12]

Robert's work in church and community groups in San Francisco was typical of his activities in such organizations throughout his life. In 1862-65 he was in charge of reading circles in New Bedford, Massachusetts.[13] At West Point in 1865-67 he sponsored a musical club.[14] Within two weeks of his arrival in Milwaukee about New Year's Day, 1874, he was admitted to the Second Baptist Church.[15] He then became, in rapid succession, chairman of the Church Bylaws Committee on March 2, sunday school superintendent on May 17, and church treasurer on June 10. At Oswego, New York, in 1883, he prepared a four-page leaflet on "Duties of Committees" for the West Baptist Church.[16]

Robert gained much knowledge as a parliamentarian from the many boards, committees, and assemblies wherein he served. He would put this knowledge to good use in writing his works on parliamentary law and in carrying on his extensive parliamentary correspondence.

When one turns to Robert's contemporaries for information on his methods as a presiding officer, two sources stand out: Lieutenant General Edgar Jadwin and Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Sr.

Jadwin had direct firsthand knowledge of Robert's procedure as chairman of boards of engineers. He served under Robert on the board of engineers in charge of construction at Galveston, Texas, following the 1901 hurricane.[17] A life-long friend of Robert, his distinction as an engineer officer nevertheless lends solid credence to his report. Jadwin was an assistant to General Goethals in the construction of the Panama Canal and rose to the position of Chief of Engineers. He held the Distinguished Service Medal of the United States, was a companion of the Order of the Bath of Great Britain, and was a commander of the French Legion of Honor.[18]

Jadwin reports two marked traits of Robert as a presiding officer: skill in the guidance of reasoned discussion, and skill in human relations.

Of how Robert used logic to lead his boards to a decision, Jadwin says:

> He was probably one of the most efficient presiding officers any Board of Engineers has ever known. Boards of which he was President generally submitted reports and recommendations in which all the members of the Board concurred. It was his practice, when the Board was acting, if he found the members apparently unable to agree, to take the position that, as they were all earnest, honest, educated and equipped with logical minds, the points of difference were apt to be due to

[11] Philip Magnus, *Gladstone: A Biography* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co., 1954), pp. 105-110.

[12] Henry M. Robert, "San Francisco Diary, 1870," collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

[13] Henry M. Robert, "West Point Notebook, 1866-1867," collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

[14] W. A. Jones to Henry M. Robert, April 26, 1901. See also, "List of Good Vocal Music for Private Study or Small Musical Clubs, September 22, 1866," in "West Point Notebook, 1865-1867." Both items in the collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

[15] Henry M. Robert, "Milwaukee Diary, 1874," collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

[16] Henry M. Robert, "Duties of Committees, West Baptist Church, Oswego, New York," collection of Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Jr.

[17] *Centennial of the United States Military Academy*, II, 191-206.

[18] "Edgar Jadwin," in *Sixty-Second Annual Report of the West Point Graduates Association*, June 10, 1931, pp. 273-275.

different understandings of the premises. He would have the premises enunciated and if they were not agreed upon then would stay on this point until the Board agreed as to what the premises were, what problem was to be solved, what considerations entered into it and what the value of each of these matters was quantitatively. Having arrived at an agreement on these points a unanimous conclusion naturally followed rapidly.[19]

While Robert's discussion leadership was subject-focused, there is no doubt that he also made effective use of human relations. Jadwin notes how Robert worked for co-operation with his subordinates: "General Robert was always extremely considerate of those under him, and felt that the best results were to be had by the most thorough co-operation. This was illustrated by his action when division engineer. He preferred, when possible, to be in a position to approve the recommendations of his district engineers. When his views differed from theirs, it was his custom, when time permitted, to take the matter up again personally and informally with the district engineer and discuss the case thoroughly with him in the hope that he and the district engineer would arrive at the same conclusion. . . ."[20]

All of this co-operative probing for common premises in discussion naturally took considerable time. It is therefore significant that Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Sr., his second wife, gives patience as one of Robert's important characteristics as a board chairman.[21] She and the General were married in 1901. She was with him at Galveston, Texas, and was his helpmate in the last revision of the *Rules of Order*.

"He'd hold those boards together, and hold them together!" says Mrs. Robert. "My, but it took time. But usually he finally got them to agree."

The General was a quiet, modest chairman, reports Mrs. Robert. She tells of an incident where a gentleman from Chicago traveled all the way to Milwaukee to observe Robert preside. He was hoping for parliamentary pyrotechnics, of course. But he returned home in disgust, saying, "Nothing happened—everything went like clockwork!"

Mrs. Robert also reports that her husband was adamant about fair play. The rights of minorities and the rights of absentee members must always be protected.

Two writings from Henry M. Robert himself, set down late in life, distill much of his wisdom as a chairman of meetings and as a parliamentarian. On the need for a common sense application of the rules of order, he wrote in 1911:

It must be impressed upon all students of Par. Law that the Chairman is continually called upon to exercise his judgment. He allows of informal consultations while undebatable questions are pending, when it expedites business. He answers a parliamentary inquiry when another member is speaking or postpones answering it just as he thinks best for the assembly. The query may be such that it ought to be allowed to interrupt the speech. The chair has to decide that.[22]

In 1915, a Mrs. B——— wrote to him. She was trying to find a method of "getting around the bylaws" of her organization. She was having trouble in getting the two-thirds vote needed for an amendment. He counseled her against this, saying that it was not wise to try to "get around" the bylaws. "In your case the only thing I can suggest

[19] Edgar Jadwin, "Henry Martyn Robert," in *Annual Report of the West Point Graduates Association*, June 11, 1925, p. 108.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 107.

[21] Mrs. Henry M. Robert, Sr., in an interview with the author, Owego, New York, August, 1954.

[22] Henry M. Robert to Mrs. William Anderson, August 7, 1911, in collection of Mrs. Wm. Anderson.

is 'persuasion'. . . . with one exception I was president of more government boards and commissions than any other graduate of the Military Academy. And yet I never failed to get a unanimous report of every board. Sometimes it seemed hopeless to others, but I never gave up trying till I succeeded. You cannot force people to agree with you. But when persons are approached in a conciliatory spirit, with an evident desire for the general good and willingness to yield personal preference where it can be done without injury to others, I have found people responsive.

"If it is possible to avoid it, I never defeat an opponent publicly. That hurts his pride and makes him an enemy. Privately talk over the matter with members of the opposition, especially the leaders, and show them the importance of the desired amendments of the bylaws. Patiently hear their arguments and weigh them and answer them. It seems to me that by judicious work of this kind you could win over enough members to give a 2/3 vote for the amendment."[23]

The total picture of Henry M. Robert as a presiding officer is an inspiring one as it emerges from the evidence I have examined. He drew from his experience the code which he put into his books. It is a code of reverence for democracy, belief in fair play, faith in reason, and considerateness for his fellow man. It is good to know that the man who is still moderator to the millions was that kind of chairman.

[23] Henry M. Robert to Mrs. B———, May 22, 1915, Henry M. Robert MSS, Library of Congress.

ELOQUENCE

Who could convince X of any truth which he does not see (and what truth does he see?) must be a master of his art. And eloquence is the power to translate a truth into language perfectly intelligible to the persons to whom you speak. Is this a vulgar power? Declamation is common; but such possession of thought as is here required, such practical chemistry as the conversion of a truth written in God's language, into a truth in X's language, is one of the most beautiful and cogent weapons ever forged in the shop of the Divine artificer.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals*, ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VIII, 313.

ELOQUENCE

Bad air, unfriendly audience, faint heart and vacant thought in the orator are things of course, and incident to Demosthenes, to Chatham, to Webster, as inevitably as to the gentlemen who address the stifling Concord Vestry this week. But here and there fell the bolt of genius, astounding and dazzling, out of this very fog and stench, burned them all up, melted away bad air, rowdy mob, coldness, aversion, partisanship, sterility, in one blaze of wonder, sympathy, and delight, and the total consumption of all this fuel is the proof of eloquence.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals*, ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VIII, 170.

STANLEY BALDWIN'S SPEECH ON THE ABDICATION OF EDWARD VIII

James C. Ching

I

WITH a policeman's cry, "Hats off, strangers!" the members of the House of Commons filed through the central lobby into their chamber at a "quarter before three of the clock." In the gallery of the House, reporters, strangers, peers, and ambassadors occupied every available seat. The Peers' Gallery was so crowded that many lords stood in the aisles. After the Government and Loyal Opposition took their places on the right and left of the House respectively, Mr. E. Dunn began the question time by addressing the Minister of Labour.

Suddenly in the middle of inquiries on machine-knitting, seasonal workers, holidays with pay, and maternal mortality, sounds of cheering and booing came from the huge crowd outside the houses of parliament. At 3:35 P.M. the House broke into cheering as Prime Minister Stanley Baldwin, with steady step and, for him, a strained air, took his seat on the front row of the Treasury Bench.[1]

A few minutes later, with the close of question time, the Prime Minister rose and moved that "the Proceedings on Government Business be exempted, at this day's Sitting, from the provisions of the Standing Order. . . ."[2] With the orders of the day set aside, Prime Minister Baldwin walked to the Bar. Holding a document above his head with his right hand, he turned to face the Speaker of the House of Commons and announced that he had a message from His Majesty the King. After bowing to the Chair, Baldwin advanced to Speaker Edward A. FitzRoy and handed him the message from Edward VIII.

Receiving the document, Speaker FitzRoy read as members with quivering faces listened in awed silence.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, *After long and anxious consideration, I have determined to renounce the Throne to which I succeeded on the death of My father, and I am now communicating this, My final and irrevocable decision.*[3]

With the close of the declaration by the King, many women and some men in the Gallery sobbed.[4] On his feet once again, Baldwin turned to the Speaker and said, "I beg to move, 'That His Majesty's most Gracious Message be now considered.' "[5]

So began the Prime Minister on December 10, 1936—a day that might ingloriously close his career in parliament.

II

For the preceding three months, rumors of a romance between the King and a once-divorced and still-married American, Mrs. Wallis Simpson, furnished sensational newspaper copy in

James C. Ching (B.A., Wabash College, 1951; M.A., University of Hawaii, 1953) is Instructor of Speech at the University of Missouri.

[1] *The* [London] *Times*, December 11, 1936, pp. 7, 16; and "Britain: After Week's Emotional and Constitutional Crisis The Empire Settles Down to Everyday Troubles—and a New King," *News-Week*, VIII (December 19, 1936), 8.

[2] *318 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 2171.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 2175.

[4] Alexander Mackintosh, *Echoes of Big Ben, A Journalist's Parliamentary Diary* (London, n. d.), p. 137. Hereafter cited as *Echoes of Big Ben*.

[5] *318 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 2176.

the United States. Since the British press kept the story from its pages, Englishmen bought up American journals to follow the romance. Most newspapers, such as *The New York Times*, kept the international love affair in the background. Some papers, however, tended to dramatize the story. For example, *The Chicago Daily Tribune* caught the public's attention with such headlines as: "U. S. Womanhood Seen Slurred By British Action"; "Wally's Illinois Friends Shatter A Few Fables: Tell Color Of Her Hair Before It Was Black"; and "Declare Wally Is Not Too Old To Be A Mother; Doctors Assail Fallacy Of Dangerous Age."[6]

When British newspapers began reporting the story on December 3, a series of reactions occurred in England. The stock market sagged alarmingly and continued in a generally downward direction until December 10. Christmas shopping decreased to a new low.[7] Uncertainty over the coronation scheduled in May began to affect business as well as employment.[8]

Public sentiment became so aroused that *The* [London] *Times* reported:

> Perhaps on no occasion in the history of *The Times* has the correspondence sent by its readers for publication been so heavy as in the week that has elapsed since His Majesty's intention of marriage became the subject of public controversy.[9]

Sensational publicity threatened the only link between the Dominions and the British Government by placing the Crown within the realm of controversy.[10] Edward VIII expressed the danger of criticism when he wrote:

> [The Crown] is founded on the premise that, if the exalted position of the Monarchy is to be preserved in the face of the encroaching cynicism of modern life, it must be held above carping and criticism.[11]

Finally, a growing King's party could mean a parliamentary struggle over supremacy of the King or Commons. Should such a conflict take place, England would witness a serious constitutional crisis.[12]

To avoid political and economic chaos, Prime Minister Baldwin pressed the King for a decision as soon as possible. On the other hand, Winston Churchill reasoned that the King had sufficient time to decide slowly on a course of action, since Mrs. Simpson's divorce would not be official for another four months. Churchill cautioned, therefore, against moving too quickly on a decision that the country might later regret.[13] In the House of Commons, however, he was hooted down when he asked Parliament to investigate the affair before acting.[14]

When Baldwin rose to speak on December 10, the Government's position

[6] December 3, 1936, p. 3; December 4, 1936, p. 1; December 11, 1936, p. 14.

[7] *The* [London] *Times*, December 3, 1936, p. 19; December 5, 1936, p. 18; December 9, 1936, p. 14; and December 11, 1936, p. 10.

[8] *The Annual Register: A Review of Public Events at Home and Abroad for the Year 1936*, ed. M. Epstein (London, 1937), p. 104.

[9] Editorial, December 10, 1936, p. 15.

[10] Under the Statute of Westminster, passed in 1931, the Dominions were fully independent in theory, and the Crown was the only legal connection between England and her Commonwealths. For a good analysis of the part played by the Statute in the abdication crisis, see John Foster, "Abdication and Commonwealth: Legal and Constitutional Problems," *The Nineteenth Century, and After*, DCCXX (February 1937), 234-249.

[11] Duke of Windsor, *A King's Story: The Memoirs of the Duke of Windsor* (New York, 1951), p. 316. Hereafter cited as *A King's Story*.

[12] Cf. Harold J. Laski, "The King's Abdication," *Nation*, CXLIII (December 19, 1936), 723; and Windsor, *A King's Story*, pp. 382-385.

[13] *The* [London] *Times*, December 7, 1936, p. 8.

[14] *318 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 1643-1644. Many members of parliament considered Churchill's political career ended by the rebuff he suffered in the House on December 7, 1936. For reaction to Churchill's setback, see *The* [London] *Times*, December 8, 1936, p. 16; and *Punch or The London Charivari*, December 16, 1936, p. 689. For Churchill's view on the rebuff, see Winston S. Churchill, *The Second World War: The Gathering Storm* (Boston, 1948), p. 219. Hereafter cited as *The Gathering Storm*.

on the crisis was clear—to accept the King's abdication. The problem facing the Prime Minister was to try to get almost complete unity on acceptance. Should he succeed, he would demonstrate to the world the solidarity of the English people on the issue, and would kill any amendment that might delay proceedings in the House. If he failed, public sentiment might have time to organize behind the King and force Baldwin's resignation. His resignation would probably mean the formation of a new government by Labourite Clement Attlee. However, since Labour generally approved of the Government's stand on the issue, the King would find it impossible to form a new government.[15] The result would be a general election where mudslinging could cause irreparable damage to the prestige of the Crown, ruin Baldwin's already tarnished reputation,[16] and embarrass Britain and her Dominions.

Baldwin's task, therefore, was not easy. Much sentiment favored the King. There were as many as ninety members of parliament who might join with Churchill.[17] A small group of extreme left Labour members felt the moment was right to modify outworn traditions and institutions.[18] Demonstrators near Piccadilly Circus and in Trafalgar Square sang the national anthem and shouted, "Stand by the King." Outside Buckingham Palace crowds gathered in the evenings, sometimes several thousand strong, shouting, "Down with Baldwin. We want the King." At the Marble Arch end of Hyde Park, orators spoke in favor of the King. Leaflets entitled "The King's Happiness Comes First," and "Stand by the King" were distributed from West End curbstones and in front of Number 10 Downing Street. *The* [London] *Times* called some of the demonstrations Fascist inspired. In America *The Chicago Daily Tribune* called the demonstrations a prelude to the premier's fall.[19] Several large British newspapers, such as the *News Chronicle*, *Daily Mail*, and *Daily Express*, favored Edward and his proposed marriage to Mrs. Simpson.[20] Letters supporting the Crown poured into newspaper offices. The following excerpt is typical:

> I for one will *never* acknowledge any other King while King Edward lives. I will recognize the woman he chooses for his wife as his Queen Consort. Let him who is without sin, in any way, cast a stone at the King![21]

III

Standing at the dispatch box, Baldwin began his speech:

> No more grave message has ever been received by Parliament and no more difficult, I may

[15] The Labour Party, through action in Commons during the crisis, had assured the Government that it stood behind Baldwin. Mr. Attlee, however, denied that any formal assurances were given by Labour. (See *The* [London] *Times*, December 7, 1936, p. 8.) This meant the King could only call on Churchill to form a new government. Since Churchill commanded a following of no more than one-fourth of Commons, his government would have been helpless against the united Attlee and Baldwin men.

[16] Baldwin had recently agreed to having Italy take over part of Ethiopia and to allowing Mussolini to assume full economic control over the unconceded part. When called on by the House of Commons to explain his action, he replied, "I have seldom spoken with greater regret, for my lips are not yet unsealed." (*307 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 856.) These concessions by Baldwin, better known as the Hoare-Laval fiasco, nearly cost him his political life.

[17] "Edvardus Rex," *Time*, XXVIII (December 14, 1936), 20-22. Cf. *The* [London] *Times*, December 5, 1936, p. 12. The exact number who still supported Churchill after his rebuff in Commons on December 7, 1936, is unknown.

[18] The small group was led by Mr. J. Maxton (Glasgow, Bridgeton, I. L. P.), and Mr. W. Gallacher (Fife, W., Communist).

[19] *The* [London] *Times*, December 7, 1936, p. 8; December 11, 1936, p. 18; and *The Chicago Daily Tribune*, December 5, 1936, p. 1.

[20] In *A King's Story*, p. 372n., Edward VIII makes an interesting analysis of newspaper circulation to show that the journals favoring him reached more people than did the circulation of newspapers against him.

[21] Editorial, *The* [London] *Times*, December 10, 1936, p. 15.

almost say repugnant, task has ever been imposed upon a Prime Minister. I would ask the House, which I know will not be without sympathy for me in my position to-day, to remember that in this last week I have had but little time in which to compose a speech for delivery to-day. . . .[22]

Now the House waited to hear him launch into his arguments favoring abdication. Instead, Baldwin avoided all controversy. Perhaps he realized that persuading the King's men to abdication demanded finesse rather than blunt argument.

Going on with his introduction, he forecast the body of the speech by saying:

I shall have little or nothing to say in the way of comment or criticism, or of praise or of blame. I think my best course to-day, and the one that the House would desire, is to tell them, so far as I can, what has passed between His Majesty and myself and what led up to the present situation.

With the transitional sentence, "Now, Sir [addressing the Speaker], the House will want to know how it was that I had my first interview with His Majesty," Baldwin moved into the body of the speech.

Throughout the first part of his forty-five minute address, in which he reviewed the events up to the middle of November, Baldwin forecast and summarized with such sentences as, "There were two things that disquieted me at that moment," "That was the first anxiety," and "That was the basis of my talk on that aspect. . . ." Sprinkled into the description of events were remarks about the King—remarks whose ultimate meaning lay hidden until later in the speech. ". . . Never has he shown any sign of offence, of being hurt at anything I have said to him," and ". . . His Majesty has been most generous in allowing me to tell the House the pertinent parts of the discussion . . ."—comments such as these had a cumulative effect by the end of his address. Some members, however, must have realized the immediate meaning of these remarks—an attempt by Baldwin to suppress rumors that he and the King were haggling over the abdication question.[23]

Baldwin now moved on to controversial grounds to answer accusations concerning his part in the abdication crisis. In reply to the rumor that he was forcing the King to abdicate, Baldwin explained:

Then His Majesty said to me . . . that he wanted to tell me something that he had long wanted to tell me. He said, "I am going to marry Mrs. Simpson, and I am prepared to go.["] I said, "Sir, this is most grievous news and it is impossible for me to make any comments on it to-day."

In answering the belief that he was preventing parliament from passing an enabling act to permit Edward to marry Mrs. Simpson without her becoming Queen,[24] Baldwin relied on his reputation for honesty[25] when he asserted that

[22] Henceforth quotations from Baldwin's speech of December 10, 1936, are taken from *318 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 2176-2186.

[23] In *A King's Story*, p. 330, Edward said of Baldwin's part in the abdication: "Undisturbed by the deafening hullabaloo in the press, the intricate constitutional negotiations were handled calmly, expertly, and always with dignity."

[24] On December 4, 1936, Baldwin refused to introduce a bill in Commons allowing the King to enter into a morganatic marriage. On the surface, Baldwin's refusal to pass an enabling act seemed favorable to the King, since Mrs. Simpson would then assume equal status with Edward in the event of a marriage. The King, however, realized that parliament was generally hostile towards Mrs. Simpson's becoming Queen and that, if he defied the House, a political struggle would result. Furthermore, Baldwin unofficially informed the King that the Dominions opposed the marriage. The King, in order to avoid any clash with parliament and the Dominions, had actually only two courses of action open to him: (1) to give up the idea of marriage; or (2) to abdicate. (See *318 H. C. Deb. 5s.*, 1611-1612; and *A King's Story*, pp. 342, 354.)

[25] For comments on Baldwin's ethical appeal, see Lord Beaverbrook, *Politicians and the Press*

". . . neither in the Dominions nor here would there be any prospect of such legislation being accepted."[26]

The Prime Minister began the final part of the discussion with another reference to the King:

> The House must remember—it is difficult to realise—that His Majesty is not a boy, although he looks so young. We have all thought of him as our Prince, but he is a mature man, with wide and great experience of life and the world. . . .

Following these remarks, Baldwin presented in the guise of a conversation he had with Edward two arguments for the King's abdication. Baldwin recalled that Edward felt kingship without a woman would be intolerable, and that his abdication would be best for the people, since it preserved "the unity of this country and of the whole Empire. . . ." Baldwin then concluded the discussion by saying:

> This crisis, if I may use the word, has arisen now rather than later from that very frankness of His Majesty's character which is one of his many attractions.

Ready now to reveal his proposition, the Prime Minister focused all these side comments about Edward into the final argument: since the King, who is a man of mature judgment and character, is willing to give up the throne for the sake of the country, the House should close ranks and accept the abdication.

Considering the hostility of part of the audience towards Baldwin's purpose, and the need of unity in final action, Baldwin should be commended for not revealing his purpose until the moment of greatest acceptance by the Opposition members. Whether consciously or not, he used the plan of development which may be the most difficult to follow, yet most excellent for hostile members—implication or the "this-or-nothing" order. Like a jigsaw puzzle, the simple portrayal of events and conversations with the King led the audience through a maze towards one inevitable conclusion—that acceptance of the abdication was the only solution.

Before going on to his conclusion, Baldwin introduced a point outside of its chronological order. Beginning with the transition sentence, "The House will forgive me for saying now something which I should have said a few minutes ago," he revealed that his Cabinet had tried unsuccessfully to change the King's mind on abdication. When they failed to alter the King's decision, the Ministers stood firmly behind Baldwin.[27] While Baldwin's transition might have been less obvious, his seeming afterthought erased any rumors in Commons about the Cabinet's position.

Baldwin closed his speech with a series of emotional appeals. Before doing so, however, he relied once again on his reputation for honesty when he declared: "My last words on that subject are that I am convinced that where I have failed, no one could have succeeded."

Baldwin began his first emotional appeal by saying:

> This House to-day is a theatre which is being watched by the whole world. Let us conduct ourselves with that dignity which His Majesty is showing in this hour of trial.

After further appeals to the sympathy and patriotism of his audience, he ended on a positive note. Confidently

(London, n. d.), p. 64; Harold J. Laski, "Britain's Baldwin," *Current History*, XLII (August, 1935), 457; and J. St. Loe Strachey, "Mr. Baldwin and his Ministry," *The Spectator*, CXXXIII (November 15, 1924), 728.

[26] Cf. *A King's Story*, p. 377.

[27] According to Edward, Mr. Duff Cooper, Secretary of State for War, did not entirely agree with the rest of the Cabinet on the abdication. Mr. Cooper unofficially advised the King to avoid a decision until public furor subsided. *A King's Story*, pp. 339-340.

assuming that his audience would vote for abdication, Baldwin declared:

> Let us look forward and remember our country and the trust reposed by our country in this, the House of Commons, and let us rally behind the new King—[HON. MEMBERS: "Hear, hear"][28] —stand behind him, and help him; and let us hope that, whatever the country may have suffered by what we are passing through, it may soon be repaired and that we may take what steps we can in trying to make this country a better country for all the people in it.

IV

In the two-day debate following Baldwin's speech, only an hour and forty-five minutes were consumed in argument. Winston Churchill, in an eight-minute speech, swung his support to the Prime Minister when he announced before Commons, ". . . I accept wholeheartedly what the Prime Minister has proved. . . ."[29] With the loss of Churchill and his followers, the Opposition was now composed of only the small group of extreme left Labour members.

On December 11 a handful of these Labour members futilely attempted to gain support for a delaying amendment. One charged the Speaker with deliberately holding up an amendment to halt action on the abdication. Another accused Baldwin and his followers of trying to force through the abdication. As a third stood to second the amendment, he was interrupted by such a commotion that the Speaker called for order.[30] When the House voted on accepting the abdication without the proposed amendment, the Opposition was pitifully defeated—403 to 5. For Baldwin it was probably his greatest victory in parliament.

The Prime Minister's handling of the abdication crisis, as well as his speech of December 10, was not greeted with universal enthusiasm from all quarters. *The* [London] *Times* reported the world's mixed reaction: astonishment in Germany; sympathy in Central Europe; sorrow in Turkey; and relief in America.[31] Bechhofer Roberts, Stanley Baldwin's biographer and severe critic, saw the whole treatment of the abdication crisis as a series of failures by the Prime Minister. As for the speech, Roberts could only approve of the applause following Baldwin's statement that "Where I have failed, no one could have succeeded."[32]

On the whole, however, Baldwin's part in the abdication was received with favor. Sir Alexander Mackintosh, a parliamentary journalist who started his reporting in 1881 when Gladstone, Disraeli, Bright, and Parnell were the giants of Commons, expressed the opinion that December 10, 1936, was a unique moment in the history of the House, and that "An age was crowded at Westminster into a day."[33] The *New York Times* announced that Baldwin regained his lost prestige by showing a boldness and directness lacking in his previous leadership.[34] *The* [London] *Times* made this editorial comment on the Prime Minister's part in the crisis:

> He may have his defects as a party leader or as an administrator; but in handling a great national problem, in which the life and standards of millions of his fellow-countrymen are concerned, he has no comparable rival either among his own colleagues or in any other walk of public life.[35]

Perhaps the greatest compliment came from Winston Churchill, the leader of a segment of the Opposition, who said:

[28] Bracketed insertion appears in *318 H. C. Deb.* 5s., 2186.

[29] *Ibid.*, p. 2190.

[30] For a complete account of the debate, see *ibid.*, pp. 2203-2220.

[31] *The* [London] *Times*, December 11, 1936, p. 15.

[32] *Stanley Baldwin: Man or Miracle?* (New York, 1937), p. 281.

[33] *Echoes of Big Ben*, pp. 137-138.

[34] December 11, 1936, p. 17; and December 13, 1936, Sec. 4, p. 5.

[35] December 11, 1936, p. 17.

"His deft and skilful handling of the abdication issue raised him in a fortnight from the depths to the pinnacle."[36]

V

Stanley Baldwin's persuasive method of bringing his audience inevitably to his desired conclusion was a logical choice on this occasion. Although he used one of the most difficult persuasive plans to follow, the Parliamentary situation on December 10 demanded overwhelming unity of action. This unity he could gain only by swinging Churchill to his side and by crushing other opposition. Thus Stanley Baldwin spectacularly accomplished his immediate purpose—acceptance of Edward VIII's abdication. Of more importance, however, was the avoidance of economic and political chaos through quick action and unanimity on the part of Commons. *The* [London] *Times* realized the greater significance of Baldwin's speech when it said:

> Every one of us may well be grateful that he remained in office with sufficient vigour to withstand the terrific strain of the last two months, and to have emerged without dividing the nation, which for a day or two was ripe for schism, or forfeiting the respect and affection of the King, with whom he was dealing for the most part single-handed, or conceding a jot of his own principles, which he knew at heart to be those of the people. . . .[37]

[36] *The Gathering Storm*, p. 218.

[37] Editorial, December 17, 1936, p. 17.

BURKE

We seem to approach an analysis of Burke's wonderful powers by observing the employment of his early years. To a man quite ignorant of mechanic arts, a penknife, a thimble, a pin, seems to be made with inexplicable ingenuity. But, on visiting the shop where it is made and seeing the successive parts of the work, in how simple a manner it is put together, the fabric loses part of its value, the composition is so easy. Something like this disappointment is felt by those who trace that complex product, eloquence, to its elements. We listen with joy to Burke explaining to the House of Commons, on the rise of an unexpected debate, all the intricacy of the Revenue Laws, or the Constitution of a Commission, or reviewing the details of legislation for years. In the midst of accurate details, he surprises us with some deep philosophic remark which, besides its own splendor, astonishes by contrast with the habits of so practical a man of business. But when we explore his youth and find him for years the author of the *Annual Register*, and that in the service of that work he spent his days in the gallery of the House of Commons, and that in those same years he also wrote a philosophical treatise on Taste and the sources of the Sublime and Beautiful, we cease to wonder at the minuteness of his official knowledge or at the loftiness of his speculation.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals*, ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VII, 262-263.

ENTERTAIN TO EDUCATE

LeRoy Bannerman

"Should educational TV be entertaining?"

Educators today, faced with the potentialities of the television medium, are floundering in indecision at this query. Until an answer is reached, either personally or collectively, educators cannot hope to approach the cameras with any degree of effectiveness.

Some educators say "no"—emphatically, and add that entertainment in any form should never be aligned with educational endeavors. They fear that the purity of the educator's message will be defiled, that the worth of its content will be watered down, that the dignity of his position and of his profession will be challenged. They charge that entertainment added to education can lead only to triviality. They say that entertainment and education are at opposite poles and that "never the twain shall meet."

Yet, is it not *amuse* instead of *entertain* to which these educators refer? While the two words are used interchangeably, there are shades of meaning that underline an important difference between them. *Amuse* or *amusement* has a French derivation (*amuser*—to muse, or to dream), which denotes diversion or the engagement of one's attention, especially during hours of leisure. The word often suggests light, purposeless, trivial, or laugh-provoking pastimes.[1] *Entertain* or *entertainment* is derived from Latin (*inter* + *tenere*—to hold) and is more formal in concept, projecting a meaning of engrossment of one's attention.[2]

Entertainment may or may not have little to do with *content,* but it is vitally concerned with *presentation.* It is the victim of bad connotation, as is the word "propaganda," and it is mouthed with distaste without any real awareness of its true meaning. In view of this important distinction, however, it cannot be said that education-made-entertaining is a blight on man's cultural horizon or that entertainment serves to obstruct the educational process. Rather, it should be looked upon as a necessary aid to educational communication, and educational TV should not disregard the art of entertainment in achieving its maximum import.

Amusement and education are two separate functions, yes, and therefore might be of little concern to each other except as they vie for the same audience. The degree to which either succeeds depends to a large measure on its success in *entertaining*—or, to put it a more palatable way, *engrossing.* To be highly entertained is not necessarily to be subjected to an educationally-deficient project—TV program, informational treatise, lecture, or what have you—but it merely means that the particular audience has found the project compelling.

Educational TV, like all mass media, finds itself faced with a prospective audience of many interests and needs, of wide educational abilities, of varied social and economic environments. To

LeRoy Bannerman, a writer-producer for the past five years with the University of Alabama's Radio and Television Broadcasting Services, is also Instructor at that university in the Department of Radio-TV Arts.

[1] *Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms* (Springfield, Mass., 1942), p. 48.

[2] *Ibid.,* s.v. "entertain."

reach all human strata (or some part of them), it is necessary to devote considerable attention to elements of entertainment—keeping, of course, within the mood and purpose of the program. This fact is inescapable even in view of educational television's stated objective to reach the "minority audience."[3] To what extent educational TV should incorporate elements of entertainment must be determined by the audience it hopes to reach. The lower the level of comprehension and interest, the higher the value of entertainment qualities; while, conversely, the higher the level of intelligence and interest, the lower the need for simplicity and cleverness of presentation.

Some educators argue that content alone can be engrossing. This is true only if the facts presented have some acceptable application to the person receiving them. The more universal the application of the program content, the fewer the entertainment features needed for its presentation.

It is altogether possible for entertainment and content to coincide, especially at the higher intellectual levels. The word "entertainment," therefore, must be defined in the light of its specific use. Its interpretation reflects the personal characteristics and attributes of the various individuals—their education, their interests, their economic status, their environment. Entertainment to some may be slapstick comedy, while to others it may lie in the suspenseful solution of a complex problem.

In short, the educational telecaster—like his commercial counterpart—must be vitally concerned with the manner by which he attracts an audience. While commercial TV strikes out for a common denominator of interest, educational television must strive for a high standard of content. The treatment of that content, however, is as important as its quality if the effort is to succeed. In order to determine an educational program's worth, the communicator must carefully analyze its elements of attraction to a desired audience in relation to the effective understanding of its message.

This is not to suggest that the successful educational TV program can be devised by rigid formulae. The creator's approach is ultimately one of intuition, based on experience and skill. If the creator is a TV expert, then a vital part of that skill is in working closely with authorities in subject matter so as to understand clearly the program's function and content. If the creator is an educator, then his skill must involve the diplomacy that recognizes the communicator's specialized ability but at the same time demands clarity, correctness, and conciseness in the presentation of his subject. Together they comprise a team, providing the elements essential to every educational TV program—soundness of content on one hand, a compelling presentation on the other.

Educational programs, where content does not always lend itself to viewer interest, may be made compelling or *entertaining* either by methods of presentation or by the inclusion of certain production features. For the utilization of either, however, the creator must adhere to strict principles of unity, causing each element of interest to blend carefully with content so as to move the audience toward a clear understanding of the over-all purpose of the program. Methods of presenting factual material effectively might include the judicious use of humor, the illustrative powers of analogy, or careful consideration of pacing. Interest value in factual presentations

[3] Edgar Dale, "Education or Entertainment," *The News Letter* (Ohio State University, February, 1955), 3.

may be heightened through the use of production features such as sound or music, film clips or animated cartoons, unusual lighting effects or camera angles.

This is not to excuse or advocate "gimmicked" productions which are so bent on *entertaining* that they completely obscure the real significance of the program. Entertaining features, adapted to approach and production, should enhance rather than detract from the program's educational importance. Production is no substitute for content. It must be remembered, too, that the higher the intellectual level of the program content, the more refined the type and limited the number of presentation features.

It is logical and natural that a scholar, armed with interest, knowledge, and a desire to share the fruits of true education, enters upon educational TV with a suspicious eye and a defensive attitude. While there are exceptions to the rule, educators are traditionally champions of formality and, trained under the rigid rules of research and study, tend to prefer and practice purity in education. They feel that facts speak for themselves, that education can stand on its own two feet, and that there is no need for outer trappings or what they distastefully term "sugar-coating."

Within limits they are right. It is good for them to guard against overproduction or the entanglements of unrelated features. They must not ignore, however, the possibilities provided by the medium that can increase the interest value of educational presentations. They must acknowledge the fact that because entertainment—in its abstract sense—reaches all levels, it is a worthy aid that will help education reach more people. They must develop not a submissive attitude but an attitude of rational regard for accepted innovations of the communicative arts.

It still remains that television, educational or otherwise, is "show business" and that showmanship is of importance in the formulation of outstanding TV fare. At no time is showmanship, properly conceived, contradictory to the best principles of education. It evolves naturally out of the best classroom situations. As Dr. Frank Baxter, an English professor who became a TV personality, once observed, "A good teacher is likely to be a born ham."[4]

To make educational TV ingenious, interesting, and inspiring is the responsibility of those who are working to make it an effective medium in our society. It must enter the race for one's time, one's attention, competing with many varied activities and occupations of our modern, ever-moving world. It can expect no favor, no consideration, and it can offer no excuse for an ineffective existence. It must seek and demand respect. Through creativeness as well as content, it must prove worthy of its cost.

[4] "The Wide, Wide World," *Time*, LXV (April 11, 1955), 95.

CRITICISM AND SOCIAL CONSEQUENCES

Thomas R. Nilsen

AN old and insistent problem in rhetorical criticism appears to be attracting new attention. I refer to the problem of whether and to what extent the effects of a speech should be within the purview of the speech critic. Let us look at some contemporary points of view.

Thonssen and Baird, in their book, *Speech Criticism,* state:

> A rhetorical judgment is a composite of data and interpretation that is intended to reveal the *effect* of a given speech upon a particular group of listeners. The word *effect,* or *response,* is all-important. It suggests the central reason for rhetorical criticism.[1]

They get support for their point of view by quoting Herbert A. Wichelns who said in his essay, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," when speaking of rhetorical criticism: "It is not concerned with permanence, nor yet with beauty. It is concerned with effect."[2]

In contrast, at least so it would seem, Parrish writes:

> It is even more important that the critic should not be diverted into an attempt to assess the result of a speech except as its effect may help us to judge the quality of the speech itself. Rhetoric, strictly speaking, is not concerned with the *effect* of a speech, but with its *quality,* and its quality can be determined quite apart from its effect. This is apparent when we consider that a properly qualified rhetorician should be able to analyze and to judge a written speech before it is delivered, and so before it can have had any effect. So also he should be able to criticize it after it is delivered without paying any attention to its effect.[3]

McBurney and Wrage have also stated that a speech should not be judged by its results, and further, not by its concurrence with truth, or the motives or intentions of the speaker (which they refer to as the ethical aspect of the speech), but by the principles of the art of speech.[4]

Wrage has called attention to this apparent conflict in the theories of criticism in his review of recent anthologies. Specifically he compared the positions taken by Baird and Parrish. "It would appear," said he, "on the face of these juxtaposed statements that we might have an issue here in the theory of criticism. But I'm not prepared to say if it is actually an issue or how much of an issue we may have. The line of thought is insufficiently developed to warrant a firm conclusion."[5]

To me there is an issue here; by no means one that is simple and clear-cut, but one much in need of discussion. It will be the purpose of this paper to examine some of the problems underlying the contrasting views just cited and to make a case for including the assessment of effect as a part of the total evaluation of a speech.

Those who argue that we should assess effects say, in short, that since a

Thomas R. Nilsen (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1953) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, Seattle.

[1] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 9.

[2] For Wichelns's essay, see *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216, especially p. 209.

[3] Wayland M. Parrish and Marie Hochmuth, *American Speeches* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954), p. 7.

[4] James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage, *The Art of Good Speech* (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953), pp. 22-32. This statement is, of course, oversimplified. The authors give reasons for their view.

[5] Ernest J. Wrage, "Voices of History," *QJS,* XL (December 1954), 417.

speech inevitably seeks and has social consequences, these consequences should be evaluated as a part of speech criticism. This, on the face of it, seems self-evident. But those who argue that the critic should not assess the results reply that in any given case so many counterinfluences may be at work that, no matter how good the speech, the speaker may not achieve his purpose. Where long-term results are considered, the influences at work are so numerous that we cannot possibly know how much a particular speech entered into any particular pattern of behavior. The truth of these statements is inescapable.

Again, those who argue for judging the effects hold that, since speeches are intended to influence human behavior, they inevitably have an ethical component. Thus an ethical judgment is also called for as a part of the total evaluation. Those who take the opposing view postulate that the speech as a speech is amoral; the ethical problem stems from the purpose of the speaker. This is outside the critic's area of judgment, since he cannot know the speaker's real intentions and couldn't evaluate them if he did. The problem is further complicated by the fact that sometimes a speech with an apparently unethical aim may serve a good social purpose, and vice versa.

However important results are—and no one disputes that they are the central reason for speeches—the above objections to the assessment of effect are unquestionably valid, given the concept of effect which they imply. But the issue is not thereby disposed of. Underlying these objections are two basic, unconscious assumptions that have precluded a different view of effects and thereby a different concept of the function of criticism. The first assumption is that *while rhetoric deals with probabilities, rhetorical criticism must not.* If we cannot know with a certain precision the effects of a speech, we have no right—not to speak of obligation—to evaluate those effects. If our ethical judgments must be relative and probable, we must withhold judgment.

This is wholly arbitrary. Of course we cannot know with certainty what the effects of a certain speech have been and still less what they will be. But that there is a recognizable and describable relationship between speeches and their effects is obvious if for no other reason than that we have well established principles of public address. These are not fortuitous prescriptions. And certainly it is not necessary to intelligent criticism that the judgments of effect be so demonstrable that critics will agree. Because two art critics do not agree in their evaluations of a work of art, they are not therefore to be considered incompetent or their judgments unsound. Because two architects do not agree on what structural design for a house will best meet the living needs of a particular family, both may not be deemed incompetent or their designs devoid of valuable features. In the area of public address, which lies somewhere between the fine and useful arts—partaking of both yet not being fully either—can there not also be competent disagreement which implies sound critical standards yet not demonstrable conclusions?

The very fact that the effects are difficult to evaluate would seem to make it all the more important that the critic attempt such evaluation, that he make speculative judgments about results, both long-term and short-term. Since cause and effect relationships between speeches and their consequences are so difficult to establish, responsibility for consequences is difficult to assign. This fact is not lost on makers of speeches; intellectual and social re-

sponsibility are not the outstanding characteristics of contemporary public address. Listeners, moreover, seem to accept a lack of integrity in public speech as normal. How lightly do we not talk of "campaign oratory" when we listen to the extravagant words of acclaim and denunciation of an office seeker on the hustings? If more critics speculated more explicitly on the possible effects of public speeches, perhaps the speakers themselves might pause to speculate too, and listeners begin to wonder whether practices like campaign oratory are a proper part of our privilege of free speech. That is, unless criticism is to be written solely for other critics.

The second assumption is that *we should view the effects from the point of view of the speaker.* The problem here is seen more clearly if we divide the effects into two classes, those the speaker seeks to achieve, and the attendant or unsought-for effects. Either set may be brief or lasting. The concern about results—both, incidentally, on the part of those who want to include them in criticism as well as those who do not—has been primarily with the results the speaker intended to achieve. From the standpoint of the speaker these are, to be sure, the most important. From the standpoint of the society upon which the speech has its impact they may not be the most important and probably often are not. It is the viewing of the social act, the speech, so predominantly from the point of view of the individual—the speaker and his purposes—rather than from the point of view of society and its purposes, that has led to much of the conflict and confusion about effects as an object of criticism. This has led to a focus of attention on the speaker's immediate success or failure, and often on his personal ethics or motives. This is not to say that the speaker's purpose should be ignored. A not unimportant aspect of criticism is the judgment of how well the speaker did what he set out to do. And we cannot overlook the ethos of the speaker when considering the responses of the listeners. But viewed in the context of the larger society in which it occurs and upon which it has its influence, and considered in terms of that society's purposes, the speaker's intention—real or imagined—and his immediate success or failure assume their more justly limited importance. Certainly the effects a speech *has* are more important to society than the effects it was or is *intended to have.*[6]

With the new assumptions that critical judgment about effects can legitimately be probable and that effects should be judged from the point of view of the society affected, a more defensible theory of the place of results in rhetorical criticism seems possible than that presented in either of the

[6] There is an interesting analogy between this view of purpose, and that of purpose or intention in art. Wayne Shumaker in his *Elements of Critical Theory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1952), p. 55, writes: "The distinction between an author's intention and that of his work has been remarked on by several of the comparatively few critics who have discussed critical methodologies in the abstract. Thus Richard Moulton: 'The conscious purpose of a poet—if he has one—belongs to his biography; what criticism means by 'purpose' and 'design' is the purpose particular parts are seen to serve in the poetic product when analyzed.'" The reference is to Moulton, *The Modern Study of Literature* (Chicago, 1915), p. 295.

W. Somerset Maugham also has commented on purpose in art: "And little as I like the deduction, I cannot but accept it; and this is that the work of art must be judged by its fruits, and if these are not good it is valueless. It is an odd fact, which must be accepted as in the nature of things and for which I know no explanation, that the artist achieves this effect only when he does not intend it. His sermon is most efficacious if he has no notion of preaching one. The bee produces wax for her own purposes and is unaware that man will put it to diverse uses." *The Summing Up* (New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, 1943), p. 304.

contrasting views cited above. It is this: *The evaluation of effect should be a judgment about the contribution the speech makes to, or the influence it exerts in furthering, the purposes of the society upon which it has its impact.* In a complex and interdependent society the effects of a speech are rarely if ever limited to the immediate audience. Almost inevitably its influence extends through subsequent words and actions of the listeners, or through other media of communication that carry the words beyond the original audience. In the case of a radio address, obviously the listening group may be very extensive. Judgment must be made in terms of a society as extensive as the direct or indirect influence of the speech. This view assumes, of course, certain fundamental purposes that are shared by members of society to a degree that they can be considered social purposes. Furthermore, it assumes that these purposes are ultimately—so far as we now know—the "right" purposes for mankind. We must admit these assumptions, recognize them as assumptions, and realize that, whatever our views, our ultimate values are postulates. This is not to say, of course, that any particular political or social institution is ultimately right; our institutions are but our groping, often unconscious efforts to achieve our ends.

What is meant here by judging a speech in terms of its relationship to the purposes of society can perhaps best be clarified by some examples. A case in point is the speech of the counsel for the defense of a criminal. The defense may win and the criminal go free to commit another crime. We would not wish therefore to abandon the right of legal defense; better that some wrongs should go unpunished or even be repeated. Human institutions are not perfect, nor do we expect them to be. Our long-term values are better served by effective speeches for the defense than by their absence. We would, besides using conventional criteria, pass judgment on such a speech on the basis of whether it fostered honest and rigorous application of the laws of the land. We might feel the need of changing the laws to bring us closer to justice, but we have other means of doing this.

Conversely, given the social purpose view urged here, we would not automatically pass favorable judgment on a speech simply because by a particular combination of circumstances it served a good social purpose at a particular time. An instance of this might be some one speech of a demagogue which is so blatantly in the interest of personal power that it serves to awaken his listeners to the dangers of demagoguery in general and the immediate demagogue in particular. The long-term purposes of our society are not served by demagogic speaking.

The problem is not one of black or white. Judgment of the kind here called for does not mean complete approval or disapproval. In the pre-Civil War era a thoughtful, carefully reasoned proslavery speech might well have served the preservation of important values in prompting a more reasoned approach to the problem of slavery than did some of the inflammatory speeches of certain abolitionists. The weight of ethical judgment might have been against the proslavery speech, but intelligent criticism would also have seen its values. Similarly, a speech advocating a different set of ultimate purposes from those assumed here might stimulate that kind of periodic reassessment of ends and means so necessary to the preservation of values, and thereby contribute to our social goals.

Perhaps we can see the problem of evaluation here more clearly if we note

the relationship among speeches, the acts or events they help bring about, and the purposes of the society within which these speeches and events occur. Speeches help to create the thought patterns and value systems which become actualized and particularized in certain actions or events. If these thought patterns and value systems are to result in events that serve the basic purposes of society, they must form a frame of reference that enables one to see the individual events in the proper relationship to each other and to the goals of society. In other words, the event or act has an immediacy and a particularity that the speech must not have if it is to contribute to an adequate, socially constructive frame of reference. What we are saying essentially is that the speech must have, besides its specific purpose, an adequate social perspective, a larger social purpose, and must embody the values society seeks to realize. Thus the ultimate ends, or values, of society must become one with the means of achieving the immediate ends. The means must, in a sense, embody the ends.

But, more specifically, what are the purposes of society, and how can we make judgments about whether a speech serves these purposes? The ultimate goal of society is the realization of its values. These values have often been stated and much discussed in the literature of our democracy; they have been summarized concisely and well by Karl Wallace in a recent article.[7] Wallace states that there are four basic beliefs that underlie our society, the belief in the dignity and worth of the individual, in equality of opportunity, in freedom, and in the opportunity for each individual to grow and develop to the limits of his ability. We cannot, quite obviously, know with any certainty whether and to what degree particular words or acts contribute to the realization of the values embodied in these beliefs. This would be to know history, past and future, with an omniscience not given to men. We can only make judgments in the light of past experience. Surely the difficulty of such judgment does not deter us from expressing thoughtful opinions, as indeed we must, on the possible consequences of the acts of men. It should not deter us from expressing thoughtful opinion on the possible consequences of speeches given, even though the latter may be more difficult.

We have said that speeches should embody the values which society seeks to realize. The criteria for judgment, therefore, are implied by the assumptions upon which our society is based,[8] and by the relationship between speeches and the actions in which they eventuate. Judgment, then, about the contribution of a speech to the purposes of society would be based on the extent to which the speech

(1) is consistent within itself and with the observed events of its time;

(2) arouses in the minds of its hearers, and later readers, as accurate a concept of the events with which it deals as possible;

(3) places foremost the ultimate goals of society and relates its immediate purpose to these goals;

(4) examines explicitly, as far as reasonably possible, the social consequences, direct and indirect, of the actions it may urge.

Since it is plain that a particular effect wrought by a speech, intentionally or otherwise, is not an adequate criterion, it follows that judgments must be

[7] Karl R. Wallace, "An Ethical Basis of Communication," *ST*, IV (January 1955), 1-9.

[8] The reader will note that the reasoning here is similar to that in the article just cited.

based on principles. But the intention is not to stop here; the principles presented above are urged as guides to making judgments about the possible effects, judgments about the contribution of the speech to the purposes of the society upon which it has an impact. *If criticism is to be socially as well as intellectually responsible it must continually relate speeches to their social consequences through the application of principles that reflect the values society seeks to realize.* If this needs further urging, let it be remembered that free public address depends upon the existence of these values and is self-perpetuating only as its effects are, in the long run, to strengthen these values. With this integral relationship of speech and social goals it seems impossible to escape the responsibility of assessing the consequences of public address if the critical evaluation is to be complete.

If the question is raised whether the rhetorical critic is competent to assess effects, it must be met by another question: who should be more fitted by training to do this? The rhetorical critic in evaluating a speech must study the speech itself, the speaker, the audience, the occasion, the dominant issues of the time, the climate of opinion. As a student of rhetoric he will have read and thought much about the relation of words to thought and action. He will have concerned himself much with the place of speeches in the stream of history, and with their relationship to social values and social action. Assuming his competence in his field, we should regard the rhetorician as the one most qualified to reason from the content, structure, and delivery of a speech, within its total context, to the social consequences of that speech. And if we expect the rhetorician to be historian enough to deal with the contemporary issues, sociologist enough to appraise an audience, psychologist enough to analyze the motivations of listeners, then it should not be asking too much that he also be philosopher enough to venture a value judgment on these consequences as well.

This paper must not be interpreted as asserting that effects alone are to be evaluated, nor even that every instance of rhetorical criticism must include effects. Most critical endeavors must be selective; the "full, evaluated apprehension of the critical subject matter"[9] is a rather large order for one piece of criticism, particularly if the subject matter is a speech with its inevitable social consequences. But the impact of public speeches on society is of tremendous importance. And for rhetorical criticism to place this impact outside the area of its judgment is to cut it off from a vital relationship with public address as a living force in society; it is to cut it off from a significant relationship to practice which can only tend toward the reduction of such criticism to a sterile discipline.

The assumptions that have stood in the way of assessment of effects are not necessary ones. With different, equally valid assumptions we can logically include the assessment of the results that are of significance to society, and develop a vital, mutually stimulating relationship between criticism and practice. Moreover, unless a sizable segment of rhetorical criticism concerns itself with effect in the sense used here, then such criticism is hardly demonstrating the kind of social responsibility that would give it license to pass critical judgment on the indubitably social act of speech.

[9] Shumaker, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

THE FORUM

SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA EXCERPTS FROM THE MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Hotel Statler, Los Angeles 28-30 December, 1955

The Council discussed the conducting of the current election of officers in the transition to the new Constitution. Wallace moved that the Council authorize the Executive Secretary to conduct the initial voting under the new Constitution between 15 May and 15 June, 1956. Davis seconded. With the consent of mover and second, action on the motion was suspended.

Aly moved that the Council recommend that the Association amend Article III, Section IV, of the Bylaws of the new Constitution by deleting "three months" and inserting "thirty days." Bryant seconded. The motion passed.

The Council resumed consideration of the Wallace motion. Motion passed.

Densmore reported for the Special Nominating Committee for Executive Secretary of SAA, submitting the name of Owen M. Peterson of Louisiana State University, and a recommendation that the Association establish a permanent office in Washington, the office to remain at Louisiana State University until such time as the Association might elect a permanent Executive Secretary. Bagwell reported at length on the specifications for and cost of a permanent office in Washington, with details of facilities and services available from NEA if SAA should request space in an NEA office building scheduled for completion in 1957.

Miller moved acceptance of the Special Nominating Committee's recommendation that Owen M. Peterson be elected Executive Secretary and that the office remain at Louisiana State University until such time as it could be moved to Washington, and that a special committee be appointed to investigate the feasibility of using space in the NEA office building to be completed in 1957.

Auer moved to amend the motion by inserting "for a three-year period" after "Executive Secretary," and by striking out "to Washington" and substituting "elsewhere." The motion was seconded and passed. Motion as amended passed.

At 9:12 p.m., 27 December, 1955, President Rousse called for the presentation of the petitions by proposed Interest Groups.

Joseph F. O'Brien submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Parliamentary Procedure. Knower moved approval of the petition. Motion seconded and passed.

Clarence W. Edney submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Administrative Policies and Practices. Miller moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

N. Edd Miller submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Discussion and Group Methods, moving its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Donald E. Hargis submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Undergraduate Instruction. Braden moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Charles A. McGlon submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Speech for Religious Workers. Constans moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Garff B. Wilson submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Interpretation. Constans moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Elise Hahn submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Speech and Hearing Disorders. Hance moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Hilda B. Fisher submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics. Constans moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Paul A. Carmack submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Forensics. Thonssen moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

W. Norwood Brigance submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Rhetoric and Public Address. Auer moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Elwood Murray submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in General Semantics and Related Methodologies. Bagwell moved its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Renshaw submitted the report of the Study Committee on the History of Speech Education,

moving acceptance of the report and of the Committee's recommendation that it be authorized to proceed with its formulation of plans concerning the content, nature, principles of organization, editor, etc., of its proposed biographical dictionary of outstanding figures in the history of speech education. Hance seconded. Motion passed.

Hochmuth submitted the report of the Project Committee on Volume III of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*. Auer moved that the Council extend high praise to the editors, especially Hochmuth, for the completion of this project. Motion seconded and passed. The Council dismissed the Committee.

Dickey submitted the report of the Project Committee on the *Volume of Studies in Southern Oratory*, stating that most of the chapter headings have been determined and most of the contributors have been appointed.

Auer moved, "Resolved: That it is the sense of the present Executive Council that in the 1956 election of SAA officials, pursuant to Article III of the Bylaws, the Executive Secretary be instructed to determine the election, in those cases in which three or more persons have been nominated, in favor of the person receiving the largest total number of votes." Motion seconded and passed.

Crowell moved, "Resolved: That the Sectional Meeting on American Public Address commend to the Executive Council of the SAA and to the Interest Group in Rhetoric and Public Address the enterprise of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission in commemorating the two-hundredth anniversary of Alexander Hamilton's birth, particularly as relating to Hamilton's employment of the skills of discourse." Motion seconded and passed.

Aly suggested that some of the Commission's funds might well be used to grant scholarships to students and grants to the institutions they attend. Willis moved approval of the suggestion and the recommendation that it be referred to the Interest Group in Rhetoric and Public Address for appropriate action. Motion seconded and passed.

Edgar E. Willis submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Radio, Television, and Film. Approval moved, seconded, and passed.

Evelyn Konigsberg submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Speech in the Secondary Schools. Approval moved, seconded, and passed.

Bower Aly, *vice* Robert H. Schacht, submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in High School Discussion and Debate, moving approval. Motion seconded and passed.

John J. Pruis submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Speech in the Elementary School. Approval moved, seconded, and passed.

Edyth M. Renshaw, *vice* Giles Wilkeson Gray, submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in the History of Speech Education, moving its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Franklin H. Knower, *vice* Charles W. Redding, submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Business and Professional Speaking, moving its approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Braden announced the Finance Committee's recommendation that SAA match any funds which regional associations may provide for travel expense of the President of SAA to annual meetings of regional associations, moving approval of the suggestion. Motion seconded and passed.

Orville L. Pence submitted the petition for the proposed Interest Group in Personal and Social Psychology of Speech. Knower moved approval. Motion seconded and passed.

Elizabeth B. Carr presented each officer of the Association with a lei, extending to the Council an invitation to hold some future convention in Hawaii.

Niles expressed the officers' appreciation for the gracious gesture.

EXCERPTS FROM MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING

Hotel Statler
Los Angeles
30 December, 1955

President Rousse presented the Executive Council's recommendation that Article III, Section IV, of the Bylaws of the new Constitution be amended by deleting "three months" and inserting "thirty days." Aly moved acceptance of the recommendation. Hance seconded. Motion passed.

Mueller, *vice* Constans, read the report of the Convention Committee on Resolutions:

The 1955 Convention of the Speech Association of America wishes to go on record as expressing its appreciation

1. To the management and staff of the Hotel Statler in Los Angeles for providing splendid physical facilities for our meetings and

superior service to the members of the Association;

2. To the Western Speech Association and to the members of the Convention Committees, especially to Milton Dickens, James Klain, and John Wright of the General Committee, and to Paul W. Smith, Verna Breinholt, Upton S. Palmer, Irvin G. Lewis, Ted DeLay, James J. Stansell, John A. Grasham, George W. Dell, Jeanette Dickens, and Henry Goodman, who served so graciously as chairmen of Special Committees;
3. To Waldo W. Phelps for arranging institute credit for attendance by the public school teachers of Los Angeles County;
4. To the Los Angeles Convention Bureau for providing valuable services;
5. To the editor, Marie K. Hochmuth, the contributors, and the publishers, Longmans, Green and Company, for producing an outstanding work, Volume III of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*;
6. To Harry Caplan and his associates for providing the scholarship and financial support that made possible the publication in *Speech Monographs* of "Pulpit Eloquence: A Doctrinal and Historical List in English";
7. To the officers of the Association for giving of their time and effort in faithful, thoughtful, and sound leadership; and
8. To the related organizations for continuing co-operation in this joint Convention which will provide significant service to the profession.

COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS
W. Norwood Brigance
Elise Hahn
H. P. Constans, *Chairman*

Bryant moved adoption of the resolutions. Kramer seconded. Motion passed.

REPORT ON ELECTION OF 1956 NOMINATING COMMITTEE

On the first ballot for the 1956 Nominating Committee, the results were as follows: total votes cast, 1,140; persons receiving more than 10 votes, 28; different persons receiving votes, 911; persons receiving one vote, 234. Those selected were the following:

J. Jeffery Auer
Waldo W. Braden
Milton Dickens
Clyde W. Dow
Wilbur E. Gilman
Frederick W. Haberman
William S. Howell
Evelyn Konigsberg
Ralph G. Nichols
Robert T. Oliver
Hugh F. Seabury
Joseph F. Smith

On the second ballot, 1,464 valid votes were cast for the twelve candidates. In tabulating the votes by the Hare system of proportional representation, the following three persons were selected for the 1956 Nominating Committee:

J. Jeffery Auer, *University of Virginia*
Waldo W. Braden, *Louisiana State University*
Evelyn Konigsberg, *New York City Schools*

COMMITTEES FOR 1956

The chairman of each committee is listed first. Names of members ex officio are italicized.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Committee on Committees: Lester Thonssen, J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Elise Hahn, Kenneth G. Hance, Wilbur Samuel Howell, Henry L. Mueller, Loren Reid, Thomas A. Rousse.

Finance: Orville A. Hitchcock (Chairman, 1 January, 1956-30 June, 1957), *Waldo W. Braden,* Loren Reid, Karl R. Wallace.

Publications: William M. Sattler, *J. Jeffery Auer,* Barnet Baskerville, *Waldo W. Braden,* Elise Hahn, *Kenneth G. Hance, Wilbur Samuel Howell,* William B. McCoard, *Henry L. Mueller, Lester Thonssen,* Frank M. Whiting.

Time and Place: Rupert L. Cortright, *Waldo W. Braden,* Milton Dickens, Kenneth G. Hance, Elbert W. Harrington, Barnard Hewitt.

Public Relations: Kenneth G. Hance, Paul D. Bagwell, *Waldo W. Braden,* Upton S. Palmer, Lester Thonssen.

Committee on Policy: Horace G. Rahskopf, H. Philip Constans, Lionel G. Crocker, Wilbur E. Gilman, Thomas A. Rousse, Karl R. Wallace.

CO-ORDINATING COMMITTEES

Committee on Co-operation between SAA and Other Related Organizations: Loren Reid, Henry Harlan Bloomer, Burton H. Byers, Paul A. Carmack, Fr. G. V. Hartke.

Committee on Co-operation between SAA and Regional Associations: Kenneth G. Hance and the presidents of CSSA, WSSA, SSA, SAES, PSA.

SERVICE COMMITTEES

Contemporary Public Address: Harold F. Harding, John W. Bachman, A. Craig Baird, Milton Dickens, Frederick W. Haberman, Robert C. Jeffrey, Gerald E. Marsh, N. Edd Miller, Ralph Richardson, Eugene E. White, Thomas F. Daly, Jr. (Consultant, *Vital Speeches*).

Intercollegiate Discussion and Debate: Glen E. Mills will be the SAA representative until 1 January, 1959. The other members of the committee are representatives of TKA, PKD, DSR, AFA, and PRP. The chairmanship rotates.

Teaching Speech to Foreign Students: Elizabeth B. Carr, Albert T. Cordray, Eva G. Currie, Paul D. Holtzman, H. Hardy Perritt.

International Discussion and Debate: Franklin R. Shirley, Paul A. Carmack, Annabel Dunham Hagood, Gordon F. Hostettler, Alan Nichols, Brooks Quimby, Mildred E. Adams (Consultant, Institute on International Education).

Committee on Discussion and Group Methods: Carroll C. Arnold, Martin P. Andersen, Dean C. Barnlund, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr., Kim Giffin, Franklyn S. Haiman, Russell L. Jenkins, John W. Keltner, William E. Utterback, Donald M. Williams.

Committee on Archives: L. LeRoy Cowperthwaite, J. Jeffery Auer, *Waldo W. Braden*, Earl W. Wiley.

Committee on Recruitment and Supply: Karl F. Robinson, Barbara E. Dodson, Evelyn Konigsberg, Wilson B. Paul, David C. Phillips, Loren Reid, Hugh F. Seabury, Leroy T Laase.

STUDY COMMITTEES

History of Speech Education: Edyth M. Renshaw, Clarence W. Edney, Douglas Ehninger, Bert Emsley, Giles Wilkeson Gray, Clifford E. Hamar, Donald K. Smith.

History of American Public Address: Robert Gray Gunderson, J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, George V. Bohman, W. Norwood Brigance, Donald C. Bryant, Robert D. Clark, Laura Crowell, Dallas C. Dickey, J. Garber Drushal, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr., Marie K. Hochmuth, Lindsey S. Perkins, Hollis L. White, Ernest J. Wrage.

Problems in the Elementary School: John J. Pruis, Jean Conyers Ervin, Geraldine Garrison, Elise Hahn, Zelda Horner Kosh, Mardel Ogilvie, Mary Elizabeth Peebles, C. Agnes Rigney.

Problems in the Secondary School: Evelyn Konigsberg, Charles L. Balcer, Mary Blackburn, Hayden K. Carruth, Lawrence S. Jenness, Freda Kenner, Yetta Graham Mitchell, Oliver W. Nelson, Bea Olmstead, Waldo W. Phelps, Oretha J. Whitworth.

Problems in Undergraduate Study: Donald E. Hargis, Mildred F. Berry, Roberta M. Buchanan, Arthur Eisenstadt, Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Alan W. Huckleberry, Robert A. Johnston, Wilbur E. Moore, William H. Perkins, Solomon Simonson, A. L. Thurman, Jr.

Problems in Graduate Study: Horace G. Rahskopf, Clyde W. Dow, Claude E. Kantner, Claude M. Wise.

Problems in Teaching Speech to Preachers: Charles A. McGlon, Fr. Edward P. Atzert, John W. Bachman, Fred J. Barton, Paul H. Boase, Edmund H. Linn, Lowell G. McCoy, John J. Rudin II, George William Smith, Abraham Tauber, Charles E. Weniger.

Problems in Teaching Radio and Television: D. Glenn Starlin, Thomas Battin, James D. Davis, W. C. Dempsey, John E. Dietrich, Marguerite Fleming, Sydney Head, Ola Hiller, Harold E. Nelson, John Roberts, Forest L. Whan, E. William Ziebarth.

Problems in Audio-Visual Materials for Teaching: Karl F. Robinson, C. R. Carpenter, John E. Dietrich, Harold E. Nelson, David Potter.

Problems in Teaching Speech in the Armed Forces: George Batka, Paul R. Beall, C. David Cornell, Ralph E. Frybarger, Cyril F. Hager, Joseph Mahaffey, Eugene E. Myers.

Problems in Voice Science: Norman Freestone, T. D. Hanley, Dorothy Huntington, Eleanor Luse, Gordon E. Peterson, Clarence T. Simon, Charlotte G. Wells.

Problems in Social Science: Orville L. Pence, Howard Gilkinson, Franklin H. Knower, Charles Lomas, Robert P. Oliver.

Problems in Phonetics: Hilda B. Fisher, Johnnye Akin, Malcolm S. Coxe, Bert Emsley, Gladys E. Lynch, C. K. Thomas, William R. Tiffany, Jane Dorsey Zimmerman.

Problems in Interpretation: Garff B. Wilson, Eugene Bahn, Ray Irwin, Charlotte I. Lee, L. LaMont Okey, Melvin R. White.

Problems in Parliamentary Procedure: Joseph F. O'Brien, Wayne E. Brockriede, J. Calvin Callaghan, Lee Chapin, Carl Dallinger, James L. Golden, Charley A. Leistner, Yetta Graham Mitchell, Lindsey S. Perkins.

Problems in Adult Education: Earnest S. Brandenburg, Thomas Dahle, Harold O. Haskitt, Jr., George L. Hinds, James N. Holm,

Franklin H. Knower, Ralph G. Nichols, Wesley Wiksell, Harold P. Zelko.

PROJECT COMMITTEES

Volume of Studies of Public Address on the Issue of Antislavery and Disunion, circa 1860: J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr.

Volume of Studies in the Colonial Period of American Public Address: George V. Bohman, Dallas C. Dickey, Ernest J. Wrage.

Volume of Studies in Southern Oratory: Dallas C. Dickey, J. Jeffery Auer, Waldo W. Braden, Lindsey S. Perkins.

Ad Hoc COMMITTEES

Committee on Awards: Paul D. Bagwell, A. Craig Baird, Kenneth B. Clark, Rupert L. Cortright, Kenneth G. Hance, Barnard Hewitt, Sara Lowrey.

Committee on Code of Professional Ethics: Kenneth G. Hance, Paul D. Bagwell, Wilbur E. Gilman, Elbert W. Harrington, Claude E. Kantner, Lee Mitchell, Wanda B. Mitchell, Richard Murphy, Forest L. Whan.

Committee on Liaison with NCTE: Donald P. Veith, Malcolm S. Coxe, Kenneth G. Hance, Lee S. Hultzén, William Schwab, Donald K. Smith, Charlotte G. Wells.

BUDGETS SUBMITTED BY FINANCE COMMITTEE AND APPROVED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL AT 1955 CONVENTION

	Revised Budget 1955-56	Proposed Budget 1956-57
Publications:		
The Quarterly Journal of Speech	$10,200	$10,200
Speech Monographs	5,000	4,000
1956 Directory of the Speech Association of America	2,750	2,750
Special Printing	500	500
Repurchase of Old Copies	250	250
The Speech Teacher	5,000	5,400
Printing and Mimeographing:		
Stationery	1,000	1,000
New Solicitations	1,000	1,000
Renewals	250	250
Placement	500	500
Convention	2,000	2,000
Personnel:		
Officers and Committees	1,500	1,500
Secretary and Clerical	15,000	15,000
Dues and Fees:		
American Council on Education	200	200
AETA Share of Convention Fee	500	500
Commissions and Discounts	1,000	1,000
Bank Charges	25	25
Secretary's Bond and Audit	325	300
Other Expenses:		
Postage and Distribution	3,000	3,000
Binding	700	700
Telephone and Telegraph	300	300
Insurance	200	200
Office Equipment	500	500
Convention Expense	1,000	1,000
Reserve Fund	500	500
Contingency	500	500
Office Supplies and Service	1,000	1,000
TOTALS	$54,700	$54,075

OFFICERS OF INTEREST GROUPS ELECTED AT 1955 CONVENTION AT LOS ANGELES

ADMINISTRATIVE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Chairman: Howard L. Runion
Vice-Chairman: Leroy T. Laase
Secretary: Clarence W. Edney
Advisory Committee: Wofford G. Gardner, Karl R. Wallace, Klonda Lynn
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Howard L. Runion

AMERICAN FORENSIC ASSOCIATION

Chairman: Annabel Dunham Hagood
Vice-Chairman: Robert P. Newman
Secretary: Malcolm O. Sillars
Advisory Committee: Hugo E. Hellman, Austin J. Freeley, Paul A. Carmack
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Laurence G. Norton

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING

Chairman: Wesley Wiksell
Vice-Chairman: Earnest S. Brandenburg
Secretary: Harold O. Haskitt, Jr.
Advisory Committee: W. Charles Redding, Harold P. Zelko, James N. Holm
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Wesley Wiksell

DISCUSSION AND GROUP METHODS

Chairman: Carroll C. Arnold
Vice-Chairman: Laura Crowell
Secretary: Martin P. Andersen
Advisory Committee: Dean C. Barnlund, P. Merville Larson, N. Edd Miller
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: John W. Keltner

GENERAL SEMANTICS AND RELATED METHODOLOGIES

Chairman: Elwood Murray
Vice-Chairman: Bess Sondel

Secretary: W. Charles Redding
Advisory Committee: Dale D. Drum, Kenneth Harwood, Delpha Hurlburt
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: W. Arthur Cable

HIGH SCHOOL DISCUSSION AND DEBATE
Chairman: James L. Robinson
Vice-Chairman: Ray Arveson
Secretary: Mary Strahon Ritter
Advisory Committee: Ivan L. Rehn, Albert L. Swank, Herb Booth
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Maurice E. Swanson

HISTORY OF SPEECH EDUCATION
Chairman: Edyth M. Renshaw
Vice-Chairman: Bert Emsley
Secretary: Donald K. Smith
Advisory Committee: Giles Wilkeson Gray, Douglas Ehninger, William M. Sattler
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Edyth M. Renshaw

INTERPRETATION
Chairman: Charlotte I. Lee
Vice-Chairman: Ray Irwin
Secretary: L. LaMont Okey
Advisory Committee: Wilma H. Grimes, Lawrence H. Mouat, Patricia A. McIlrath
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Ray Irwin

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE
Chairman: Joseph F. O'Brien
Vice-Chairman: Alice F. Sturgis
Secretary: James L. Golden
Advisory Committee: Wayne E. Brockriede, William S. Tacey, Yetta Graham Mitchell
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Joseph F. O'Brien

PERSONAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY OF SPEECH
Chairman: Orville L. Pence
Vice-Chairman: Howard Gilkinson
Secretary: Gale L. Richards
Advisory Committee: Clarence T. Simon, Donald E. Sikkink, Robert T. Oliver
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Orville L. Pence

RHETORIC AND PUBLIC ADDRESS
Chairman: W. Norwood Brigance
Vice-Chairman: Carroll C. Arnold
Secretary: Laura Crowell
Advisory Committee: Ernest J. Wrage, Douglas Ehninger, Robert Gray Gunderson
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Bower Aly

SPEECH AND HEARING DISORDERS
Chairman: Jesse J. Villarreal
Vice-Chairman: R. Corbin Pennington
Secretary: Tina Bangs
Advisory Committee: Mildred F. Berry, Robert West, Severina E. Nelson
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Jesse J. Villarreal

SPEECH FOR RELIGIOUS WORKERS
Chairman: Charles A. McGlon
Vice-Chairman: P. Merville Larson
Secretary: William Carson Lantz
Advisory Committee: James H. Jackson, Edmund Holt Linn, John J. Rudin II
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Charles E. Weniger

SPEECH IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Chairman: John J. Pruis
Vice-Chairman: Geraldine Garrison
Secretary: Mary E. Peebles
Advisory Committee: C. Agnes Rigney, Elise Hahn, Mardel Ogilvie
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: John J. Pruis

SPEECH IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL
Chairman: Evelyn Konigsberg
Vice-Chairman: Waldo W. Phelps
Secretary: Freda Kenner
Advisory Committee: Betty May Collins, Bea Olmstead, Rowena H. Roberts
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Oretha J. Whitworth

UNDERGRADUATE SPEECH INSTRUCTION
Chairman: Donald E. Hargis
Vice-Chairman: Henry L. Ewbank, Jr.
Secretary: A. L. Thurman, Jr.
Advisory Committee: Roberta M. Buchanan, Alan W. Huckleberry, Tom Sawyer
Delegate to Legislative Assembly: Donald E. Hargis

REPORT ON THE SAA PLACEMENT SERVICE

During the period from 1 September, 1954, to 1 September, 1955, administrators listed over four hundred thirty requests for teachers of speech with the SAA Placement Service. Inquiries came from forty-seven states. Openings were in private clinics, public schools, junior colleges, colleges, and universities. The distribution of level of openings was as follows:

University and college faculties	216
High School faculties	56
Graduate assistantships	35
Clinic posts	125

The distribution by areas was as follows:

Public address (including fundamentals of speech, public speaking, communication skills, discussion and debate)	106
Radio and television	23
Speech correction	150
Voice and diction and phonetics	9
Theatre	52
Other areas	5

Worthy of note is the fact that the principal demand was in the areas of public address, theatre, and speech correction. Except for vacancies in speech correction, the majority of employers were seeking candidates who could teach courses in more than one area. Frequently a department head sought a specialist who could also teach a section or two of fundamentals of speech or public speaking.

In the field of speech correction the demand was apparently much greater than the supply. About seventy per cent of the openings in this area were in public schools; approximately ten per cent were in private clinics.

Most of the college and university positions were at the rank of instructor or assistant professor: in those cases in which rank was indicated, seventy-eight per cent of the requests were for instructors, nineteen per cent for assistant professors. The salaries for thirty-two per cent of instructorships were between thirty-five and thirty-nine hundred dollars (for nine months). Salaries for fifty-seven per cent of the assistant professorships ranged between four thousand and forty-four hundred dollars. The range of salaries for high school positions was between twenty-five and forty-five hundred dollars, the median falling somewhere between thirty-five and thirty-nine hundred dollars. In many instances high schools offered larger salaries than colleges did.

Between eight and nine hundred members of the Speech Association of America availed themselves of the Placement Bureau's services.

PRESENTATION OF "A HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS," VOLUME III

(EDITOR'S NOTE: *On Wednesday, December 28, 1955, at a general session of the Los Angeles convention of the SAA, the AETA, the WSA, the NSSC, the NUEA, and the AFA, Professor Marie K. Hochmuth presented to the SAA, and Professor Waldo W. Braden accepted for that organization, the third volume of* A History and Criticism of American Public Address. *The speeches delivered in connection with this ceremony are printed below, and elsewhere in the present issue of the* QJS *Professor Everett L. Hunt's review of the* History *is featured.)*

MISS HOCHMUTH'S SPEECH

At the Salt Lake City convention in 1947, Professor William Norwood Brigance of Wabash College, Professor Donald C. Bryant of Washington University, and I were asked to assume responsibility for planning and editing a volume which was expected to be a continuation of a series of studies in the history and criticism of American public address, the first two volumes of which had appeared in 1943.

We were advised that an earlier committee, consisting of Professors A. Craig Baird, Bower Aly, William Norwood Brigance, and Karl Wallace, at work since 1946 selecting the men and women to be singled out for special study in a projected new volume, had now completed its work and was asking us to carry on.

In October, 1955, our project was completed and Volume III of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address* issued from the press of Longmans, Green and Company.

Six years in the making, we trust the volume represents both the earnestness and the labor that have gone into it. We trust, too, that the volume represents the advance in rhetorical scholarship which might have been expected from the stimulus and example of its predecessor.

Your editors should like to take this opportunity to express gratitude to the original committee and to all those contributors who have made the volume possible. We should like to record here what we believe to be a supreme testimony of the co-operativeness, patience, and—perhaps—endurance of those contributors. Once your editors had

selected authors for the series of studies, no change was necessitated for any reason throughout the entire duration of the project.

To our publishers, we are infinitely indebted for kindness, courtesy, patience, and expert advice throughout the entire project. To Robert L. Straker, Charles Hillard, Frank Poland, and Dorothy Upjohn Lewis, representatives of our publishers, I should like to express a personal word of gratitude for sympathetic counseling and assistance.

And now, Mr. Executive Secretary, I should like to present to this association Volume III of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address.*

MR. BRADEN'S ACCEPTANCE

As the official representative of the Speech Association of America, I am pleased to accept this volume in the name of the Association. The publication of *A History and Criticism of American Public Address,* Volume III, marks a signal achievement on the part of the contributors, the editors, and the publisher. I should like to extend the thanks of the Association to all the persons who made this volume possible. I should like to extend my especial thanks to Longmans, Green and Company for their confidence in and support of our Association and its project.

LAMARTINE

At the Chamber of the National Assembly, by the kindness of Mr. Rush, who lent mé his diplomatic ticket. Lamartine made his speech on the question of Poland. He was quite the best and indeed the only good speaker I heard in the house. He has a fine head, and a free and superiour style of delivery, manly and cultivated. But he was quite at his ease, no sword or pikes over his head this time, and really little energy in his discourse. He read many extracts from letters sent him from Italy, and when he was tired, the members cried out, *Resposez vous!* and the President gave an intermission for half an hour.

The whole house of nine hundred members obviously listened with great respect and gladly to Lamartine, for they want information, and it has been rather parsimoniously given by any whom they could trust. His speech is reckoned wise and moderate. To me it looks as if a wise Frenchman should say to his country, Leave Poland and China and Oregon to themselves. You have more than enough to do, at present, in constructing your own government and dealing with disorder, hunger, and faction in France.—But Lamartine praised the new republic because it had not a moment of Egoism, but had adopted Poland and Italy.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals,* ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VII, 469-470.

ELOQUENCE

The eloquent man is he who is no beautiful speaker, but who is inwardly and desperately drunk with a certain belief. . . .

The hearer occupied with the excellence of the single thoughts and images is astonished to see the inspired man still impatient of the tardiness of words and parts, pressing forward to new parts . . . and in his prodigality ever announcing new and greater wealth to come.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals,* ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes (Boston and New York, 1912), VII, 105.

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

THOUGHTS ON A HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS

Everett L. Hunt

This volume is announced as a companion piece to the two-volume work on the *History and Criticism of American Public Address,* edited by Norwood Brigance and published in 1943. So far as I know, no other forthcoming companion piece has been announced, but the possibilities would still seem to be large, and the purposes of such volumes will change and grow as criticism changes and grows, and as the interest of a public develops. The three volumes we now have are much more than a substantial beginning. All the speakers included are such figures in American Public Address that no captious questions can be raised about their inclusion, It is the obvious duty of our scholars to discuss them and to make them interesting to a wide range of readers outside the membership of the Speech Association of America. The success of such volumes will depend upon the ability of the scholarly critics to transcend the limitations of critics writing for critics, or of would-be speechmakers trying to learn how to make speeches. The development of studies in a field that is increasingly referred to as American Civilization will indicate a direction of growth, but even such limits ought not to be accepted. Studies in Communication suggest other almost frightening possibilities, and Wichelns' essay on The Literary Criticism of Oratory will suggest what seems to me a still wider range.

In the preface to the first volume, Professor Brigance has been quite explicit. "This work deals with the influence of American public address on the flow of history. . . . That public address may have permanent and aesthetic excellence is not denied, nor is it ignored; but final judgment is here based on effect instead of beauty, on influence instead of appeal to the imagination." In Miss Hochmuth's introductory essay on The Criticism of Rhetoric, she enlarges on this conception. "This analysis highlights the significant role that *purpose* plays in evaluating speechmaking. . . . In an age oriented toward quick and tangible evidence of success, the critic has tended to make the specific accomplishments of ends the test of rhetorical effectiveness. . . . Persuasion requires choices among alternatives. . . . Hence the speaker's persuasions represent directly or by implication his philosophic outlook and commitment. But to evaluate a speaker's philosophy involves the critic in a discrimination of ethical values. . . . Style is in no sense magic. It is rather a manifestation of a speaker's or writer's temper and outlook. . . . To look to style for manifestations of the groundswells and

Everett L. Hunt, Dean of Swarthmore College, was editor of the QJS *in 1927-1929 and is a steady contributor to this journal.*

tensions of our times, for manifestations of healthy states and unhealthy ones must become the imperative task for the critic concerned with the implications of his art for the nation and the world. . . .

"Our common humanity is best studied in the most eminent examples that it has produced of every type of human excellence. . . . Human excellence has sometimes manifested itself in speechmaking. Human effort has sometimes been directed to the end of giving clearer vision and safer passage into an unknown future. In this the orator has shared eminently. Sometimes asserting or reasserting human values, sometimes helping to resolve conflicts of national or international scope, the speaker has through his art attempted to point the way to a better life. In searching for effective methods of evaluating the impact of words, we search for methods whereby we may criticize present assumptions about human behavior and the forces which have operated to produce our culture."

This may seem a somewhat exalted conception, but it recalls Emerson's reply to the criticism about his glittering generalities. "Yes, sir," he said, "they do glitter, they have a right to glitter." And when one tries to make the generalities of the paragraph above more concrete by citing some of the speakers presented in this volume—Hamilton, like Burke, one of the creative spirits of his time defending the Constitution; Thomas Hart Benton, extending economic and political democracy, fostering the development of the West, preserving the Union; Harry Emerson Fosdick breaking the shackles of the old fundamentalism while attempting to preserve the emotional values of the old religion; Franklin Roosevelt setting in motion tremendous social and moral forces to combat evil—all this array of varieties of oratorical excellence does warrant large claims for the significance of rhetorical criticism.

The variety of excellence, I think, calls for a variety of criticism, but critics have been notoriously fond of method. The historical critics of literature have proclaimed that they wanted only to explain how a work came about. The judicial critics have stated that the proper assessment of values was the only thing that mattered. The impressionists have said that both of these attempts were a chasing after the wind, and the only thing that is possible of attainment is to describe what this work means to them. As Anatole France said, the honest critic will say, "I am about to write an essay on myself apropos of Shakespeare." And more recent critics find the explication of meaning so complicated that there is no room for anything else.

For me the excellence of the volume discussed lies in its variety, and I hope no attempts will be made to standardize the methods of rhetorical criticism. There is a danger that we might draw up a list of the qualities of the effective speaker, and simply plot a curve for each orator and let it go at that. I was especially interested in the chapter on Clarence Darrow for its philosophy and psychology. The account of Darrow's frustrations as a source of his pity and his desire to espouse causes of the underdog was illuminating and interesting. There is an element of frustration in every orator's life, I suppose, and his relation to his father is usually significant, but it would be unfortunate if the Darrow study should prescribe a method.

The treatment of Harry Emerson Fosdick was especially interesting to me, because of my own interest in the

religious issues involved. Moody, too, talked of religion, but in terms so outworn that the focus was rightly, I think, shifted from religion to psychological methods and results. So much has been written about Franklin Roosevelt, and the issues of his time are still so much in the memories of most of us, that it was well to concentrate on methods of speech preparation and his Groton-Harvard accent. There is not the need to reproduce the past as in the artistic and literary historical summary that Marie Hochmuth gave us as an introduction to Lincoln's First Inaugural in *American Speeches*. Theodore Roosevelt might be thought to require more historical treatment, but his ideas were so little rooted in history that his personality and his devotion to the elemental virtues became more important. George William Curtis is another figure so occupied with lay sermons that history seems incidental. The summary of his four basic premises would seem to be equally relevant in any decade of our history. With Thomas Hart Benton an interest in the history of his period is almost a necessity to rescue him from oblivion, but, given that, he comes alive in heroic proportions in the chapter by Norman Mattis. Alexander Hamilton is treated with a mastery of compression only possible to one who has studied him long, as Bower Aly obviously had in his preceding work, *The Rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton*. The final judgment is the judgment passed on an orator, but it is much more than that:

> Without speaking to posterity he nevertheless was so heavily engaged in developing universal principles that his speeches more than most have a pervasive and a permanent quality. Hamilton leaves evidence of his power to find and invent ideas that were effective in his time and profoundly influential in time to come. . . . Hamilton, as orator and good citizen, merits a recognition that he has not had, partly because he has been misunderstood. The rich have thought him their special friend. The poor have thought him their special enemy. Both have been mistaken. Profoundly skeptical of the virtues of human beings, he wished so to order events as to employ even their vices in their own interest. A conservative statesman, a conservative orator, he voiced his hopes and fears with equal eloquence, and in his characteristic utterances disdained to resort to the demagogic appeals sometimes thought necessary to maintain health within the commonwealth.

Shall we call this verdict rhetorical criticism, or shall we call it an historical, ethical, or logical judgment? At any rate, it is such insight we seek more than a statistical enumeration of figures of speech.

If one were to write a book on American bridges, he might regard them as avenues of communication between opposite shores, he might give the exact formula of stress and strain for strength of materials, he might concern himself with the beauty of bridges, he might contrast American bridges with Roman, he might discuss the politics back of an appropriation of public funds for building the bridge, or discuss the decision to make it a toll bridge, or lament the ferries displaced by the bridge. He might write for specialists or for the general public, and he might write a dozen books for a dozen different types of specialists, each relatively remote from the other. And they all might debate, I suppose, about the essence of bridgeness in discussing bridges. Surely the orator is an equally complicated figure in communication, and we shall not want to reduce our volumes of criticism to one stereotype. The editors of the present volume are to be congratulated on achieving an admirable balance of unity in variety. Reading these essays fills the reviewer with a desire to have more such volumes. There is a large place in speech mono-

graphs and professional journals for the engineering of persuasion, but here we have rhetorical criticism as a humane study.

BOOK REVIEWED

A HISTORY AND CRITICISM OF AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS. Prepared under the auspices of the Speech Association of America. Vol. III. Marie Kathryn Hochmuth, Editor. Associates, W. Norwood Brigance, Donald Bryant. New York, London, Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1955; pp. 554. $7.00.

MINOR ATTIC ORATORS, II: LYCURGUS, DINARCHUS, DEMADES, HYPERIDES. With an English translation by J. O. Burtt. Loeb Classical Library: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann, 1954; pp. xv+620. $3.00.

Special volumes of the Loeb Classical Library have been devoted to Lysias, Isocrates, Isaeus, Aeschines, and Demosthenes, and Volume I of the Minor Orators, issued in 1941, gave us the extant speeches of Antiphon and Andocides. The present volume therefore completes the edition and translation of the ten Attic Orators of the canon. All the orators in this volume belong to the fourth century.

Mr. Burtt deserves praise for providing a text that gives evidence of careful and excellent judgment, useful Introductions (perforce brief) and notes, and a clear and accurate English rendering. He supplies us also with an Index of Proper Names, and an Index of Selected Greek Words appertaining to both volumes. Misprints in a book of this kind are almost never entirely avoidable; I have noticed only "tratior" for "traitor" (p. 103), "Appolo" for "Apollo" (p. 143), "wordly" for "worldly" (p. 319), and "Herennum" for "Herennium" (p. 1 of the list of volumes of the Loeb Library). "Suidas" (better: "the Suda") is the name of the Lexicon, not of its compiler (pp. 136, 563, and elsewhere).

Jebb's appraisal of the only complete speech we have of Lycurgus, "Against Leocrates," still commends itself; the speech combines Isocratean elements and archaic. It repays study for the nature of its invective, its employment of *exempla*, its religious fervor, and especially for its laudation of the role of poetry in inspiring bravery and patriotism: "Poets, depicting life itself, select the noblest actions, and so, through argument and demonstration, convert men's hearts." Euripides, Homer, and Tyrtaeus are quoted in long passages, and Simonides in two epigrams. Lycurgus asks that the pledge exchanged by the Greeks at Plataea be read in order to remind the hearers of the courage of their forbears; for our generation its final sentence has a timely ring: "I will not rebuild a single one of the shrines which the barbarians have burnt and razed, but will allow them to remain for future generations as a memorial of the barbarians' impiety." The "argument" (*hypothesis*) heading the speech includes a discussion of the *status* of the case; the issues at once involve conjectural, legal, and juridical considerations.

Of the three extant speeches written by Dinarchus, the "small-beer Demosthenes," that against Demosthenes, although no great oration, will interest the technical student because of the author's addiction to certain special figures of speech, and of his persistent use of the topic of Demosthenes' ill-luck (pp. 195, 227, 229).

Demades, prominent in the pre-Macedonian party, was not one of the canon, nor were his speeches left to posterity. The oration "On the Twelve Years," included in the Corpus and presented here, is not by him and is not of superior quality, and yet it contains a few flashes of the poetic style linked sometimes to the comic which Demetrius (*On Style* 282 ff.) found characteristic of him: ". . . lit up Greece with the fires of war;" "Freedom is not on guard against a spy;" "Demosthenes, a little man made up of syllables and a tongue." It is regrettable that the sayings of Demades which have been preserved did not find a place in this volume; for example, "Mighty Macedon without Alexander is like the Cyclops without his eye."

Longinus said of Hyperides that he spoke in a greater variety of tones than Demosthenes. Although it was in forensic oratory that he excelled and was most active, Hyperides rose to heights of sentiment in the *Epitaphios*, which glorifies Athens and honors the heroes of the Lamian War. This speech occupies a place of distinction in the history of funeral orations, and the special praise of Leosthenes invites comparison with the eulogies of individuals in later epideictic. For a rhetorical study of the oration I would refer the reader to a Master's dissertation (The *Euxenippos* and *Epitaphios* of Hypereides Rendered into English, with an Introduction), 1938, by Rita Carey, available (typewritten) in the Cornell University Library. Only two insignificant fragments remain of Hyperides' once famous

little speech in defense of Phryne (who served as the model both for Praxiteles' Venus of Cnidos and for Apelles' Venus Anadyomene); the reader will recall Quintilian's instances (2.15.7 ff) of persuasion by non-verbal means—Antonius appealed directly to the eyes of the Roman people by tearing open the tunic of Manius Aquilius and exposing the honorable scars he had acquired in battle; Servius Galba aroused pity by bringing his little children before the Assembly and thereby escaped condemnation; and Phryne won acquittal by disrobing in court. Finally, a passage in a speech of Hyperides cited in Latin by Rutilius Lupus expresses neatly the patriotic ideal of this leader of the anti-Macedonian party: "We have either to put our trust in laws and so remember freedom, or else to be surrendered to the power of one man and brood over slavery."

HARRY CAPLAN,
Cornell University

THE YOUNG AUGUSTINE. By John J. O'Meara. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1954; pp. xv+215. 21/.

Professor O'Meara skillfully treads his way between the common extremes of simple piety and bitter attack in an effort to interpret Augustine, not in terms of any psychological theory but from the standpoint of a history of Augustine's ideas up to the time of his conversion. The primary sources for the study are the *Confessions* and Possidius' *Life*. O'Meara has an initial advantage over some critics in that he sees the *Confessions* not only as admissions of past aberrations but also as confessions of faith and of praise.

Another advantage which O'Meara enjoys is that he understands Augustine, the rhetorician. He is able to discern various exaggerations of idea and extravagances of form as typical of the age. Augustine's fondness for indefinite expressions poses no mysteries and his predilection for dreams, visions, and voices is seen in proper perspective as characteristic excess of sophistic expression. At the same time, Professor O'Meara recognizes that what is rhetorical is not necessarily false.

The second and sixth chapters are of special interest to students of the history of rhetoric. In the former, we find a careful review of Augustine's early training, especially in grammar and rhetoric. Although there is nothing particularly new here, the North African setting is enough different in its provincial atmosphere to warrant comment. In the sixth chapter, the writer points out that it was in Carthage that Augustine began to put his education into practice, and it was here that he began to do the questioning and reading (e.g., Aristotle's *Categories*, Porphyry, Plotinus, and others) which indicated an honest effort to deepen his knowledge and led to his growing resistance to the insincerity of the rhetoric of his time

Works on Augustine frequently focus attention on his moral conversion only. O'Meara goes much farther in tracing Augustine's intellectual conversion from material Manicheism as a negative polemic against Christianity through ascetical Neo-Platonism as a way of ascent towards the Good to a reasoned submission of the intellect and will to Christian philosophy. On the whole, *The Young Augustine* is a thorough and satisfying addition to the rather meager literature on the subject in English.

RAY NADEAU,
University of Illinois

THE EXPANSION OF ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND. By A. L. Rowse. New York: St Martin's Press, 1955; pp. 450. $5.75.

Elizabethan England has for the historian the fascination which the Golden Age of Athens exerts upon the classicist. His mind is drawn inevitably to those halcyon days when English enterprise and courage were directed to exploration and colonization, especially of North America—the decisive fact in modern world-history, in the judgment of the greatest living Englishman. The impact of the Renaissance upon the people, their institutions, and their aspirations has been previously reconstructed with loving scholarship by such as Neale from the point of view of intellectual and spiritual characteristics. But here in this second book of a trilogy by A. L. Rowse is offered a new and splendid contribution in living words from an active and factual appraisal. It stresses the forceful energy with which late Tudor expansion influenced local backward areas such as Wales and Ireland and then the new world. It will occupy a place of honor and utility on the shelves of all whose study of rhetoric and public address impels them to a close and factual understanding of this greatest of English historical periods.

Mr. Rowse writes of men and action. He tells, in language strikingly indebted to original sources, of exploration, fighting, voyages, armed camps, fighting ships, conquest, and administration in Wales, Ireland, the Low

Countries, the Americas, and of seas and oceans cut for the first time by English keels. His pages throng with the great and the common —Burghley, Walsingham, Sidney, Hakluyt, Gilbert, Raleigh, Grenville, Drake, Hawkins, Hudson, and their peers, as well as with the lives and deaths of men of the fourth estate. In particular, new light is shed upon military and civil organization by the Queen's captains, admirals, and diplomats.

There has been skillful use of Carlyle's dictum that the lives of great (and small) men record the history of their country. The rhetorician will pay special heed to Mr. Rowse's evidence, much of it quite new, on manipulation of public opinion for political purposes. He will also gain new insight into the verbal skills of Elizabeth, notably at Tilbury in 1588 in her greatest public speech, and into her experience with thrust and parry conversations with such as the brash captain newly returned from the Irish Wars.

But interest will be aroused on other grounds than these. Significant data on land tenures in Ireland and Wales are provided for the professor of law; military and naval men will learn much about military and naval musters, equipment, tactics, and discipline at muster, in camp, and on the field of battle. These are implemented by some twenty-six illustrations of maps, cities, and portraits in addition to the frontispiece.

The organization and style are of the high order of excellence which have distinguished past publication of Mr. Rowse. But it is to be regretted that a Latin sentence on the title page, *"Si oblitus fuero tui Jerusalem, oblivioni detur dextra mea,"* (which expresses the love of their countries shared by David and Mr. Rowse), should be cited from Psalm 136 instead of Psalm 137 where it may actually be read.

GEORGE P. RICE, JR.,
Butler University

BISHOP LANCELOT ANDREWES. By Maurice F. Reidy, S.J. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1955; pp. xiii+237. $3.50.

The seventeenth-century Protestant church was a "church whose members had little but confusion in thought or practice for the years since the break from Rome." Such unexplained and unsupported statements in a book which hopes to make a contribution toward the "satisfactory" appraisal of a member of the Protestant church leads one to carefully examine the appraisal. When one does so he discovers it to be an exegesis on the Roman Catholicity of Lancelot Andrewes. The question which the author establishes as his point of investigation in the introduction, "What did Lancelot Andrewes preach to his Elizabethan and Jacobean audiences on the subject of Christian ascetical practice, and the relation that exists between the two?" he answers in the body of his book, "Andrewes had traditional and Catholic inclinations" that tinged all his sermons.

This conclusion is at variance with many previous evaluations of Andrewes. John Henry Overton in the *Dictionary of National Biography* states, "He [Andrewes] was a thorough English churchman, as far removed from Romanism on the one hand as from Puritanism on the other . . . he was a decided anti-Romanist." The *Cambridge History of English Literature* supports this view of Andrewes. Evidence for Mr. Reidy's conclusion is derived mainly from quotations from Andrewes' *Works*, especially his sermons. Certain maunscripts were examined, the author reveals, but used "very little . . . for most of it was irrelevant to the problem of the study." Inferences made from these quotations are not always warranted. For instance, from evidence indicating that Andrews was fond of using Roman Catholic authorities, the author infers that "he showed himself a child of his age." While it is true that the Anglo-Catholic preachers studied and quoted Patristic literature, this is not true of the Anglicans and non-Anglican preachers as W. Fraser Mitchell points out in his book *English Pulpit Oratory*. The author is also guilty on at least one occasion of quoting out of context. He does this with the celebrated "Immanu-el . . . Immanuhell" passage to prove that it is an "outrageous verbal fault." W. Fraser Mitchell long ago berated this practice among authors as "unfair to Andrewes" for "actually as it [the passage] occurs in one of the Nativity sermons it is extremely striking and effective . . . not undignified and certainly not irreverent."

There is little in this study that will interest any but the ecclesiastical historian. Three short chapters on the man, his work, his style are pedestrian and offer no new light for rhetoricians. Variations on the theme that Andewes was influenced by the church fathers, that he believed in the "full Catholic position" concerning the Eucharist, and other theological matter merely reiterate the theme that the Anglican "star of preachers" was Anglo-Catholic.

It is regrettable that a reading of Bishop Andrewes' *Works* did not inspire Mr. Reidy to a more complete investigation of his subject. This seventeenth-century "angel in the pulpit" has richer rewards to offer the researcher than have been uncovered here.

ROY F. HUDSON,
University of Wichita

THE BIRTH OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS. By Robert Allen Rutland. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955; pp. 243. $5.00.

Re-examination of well-known evidence on early American themes through the study of special topics such as *The Birth of the Bill of Rights* is bringing about a much better understanding of what really happened. We are familiar with well-sustained re-interpretations by recent historians of the effectiveness of the Confederation, prosperity and the conservative propaganda of chaos in the 1780's, and the extent of the conservative victory in the Convention of 1787 which produced a document that did not include guarantees of several personal rights which had received some attention in state charters. However, even in the minute scrutiny to which proceedings of the ratifying conventions have been subjected, no one seems to have focused primarily on the history of those amendments to the Constitution which are commonly called the bill of rights.

In topical studies, a distinct advantage can be the creation of accurate perspective for the major achievements of man in ideas, legal patterns, or institutions. By sketching early British and Colonial efforts to guarantee personal rights, Mr. Rutland follows the pattern set so admirably in Mary P. Clarke's little volume, *Parliamentary Privilege*. To these earlier chapters he adds a careful examination of these rights in the state constitutions. In the Convention, he examines in detail the tardiness with which even George Mason, author of the Virginia Declaration of Rights, realized that a strong central government might override the states' guarantees of personal liberty. Soon afterwards, however, the omission of a bill of rights in the Constitution became clear to many opponents as "the chief stumbling block to ratification" and the federalists were placed on the defensive in several ratifying conventions until they conceded that amendments guaranteeing personal rights would be needed. The author interweaves documentary evidence with letters and notes of debates to create a very readable picture of proceedings in the ratifying conventions and the First Congress. Time sequences of the conventions are exceptionally well handled. The weakest part of the study is the brief effort to survey what has happened to these guarantees since 1791.

Students of American public address will find speeches and notes of speeches prominently used in evidence, and, on the whole, a good awareness of the interrelations of different means of persuasion in and out of the conventions. The debates on the author's theme in the ratifying conventions are well summarized. But there was no place in this study for substantial rhetorical criticism. What there is is implied in accounts of effective countermatching of the antifederalists by Madison and Hamilton.

In a broader sense, the theme itself is of great interest to students of speech, for several of the guarantees in the bill of rights directly or indirectly support and maintain free discussion in the United States.

GEORGE V. BOHMAN,
Wayne University

THE SOUTH LIVES IN HISTORY: SOUTHERN HISTORIANS AND THEIR LEGACY. By Wendell Holmes Stephenson. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1955; pp. xiii+148. $3.00.

Of the contributions of Professor Stephenson to Southern history by means of lectures, seminars, writings, and editorial efforts, this book is one of his finest. It is about three historians of the South—William E. Dodd, Ulrich B. Phillips, and Walter Lynwood Fleming—who were made the subjects of essays by the author, who delivered the Walter Lynwood Fleming lectures at Louisiana State University in 1955. Subsequently, a fourth essay, "The Southern Avenue to Now," was written as an introductory chapter "to place the three in the context of the period in which they taught and wrote."

This reviewer, himself the recipient of Professor Stephenson's scholarship through many years of association and comradeship, has read this book with an absorbing interest and appreciation which he hopes will be shared by many serious students of Southern history and historiography. This may be impossible to the same degree for those who have not felt the impact of the author in a very personal manner, but the essays will provide an appreciation of his vast readings, intensive research, and mature reflections. Only a man with his equipment could have produced this book. The preface must be read to capture the flavor of

the author's purpose and ideals. The first chapter, "The Southern Avenue to Now," permits the reader to range with Professor Stephenson over and through vast bodies of exciting items of information before concentrating on his interpretations and evaluations of the three historians selected.

William E. Dodd, designated as "Historian of Democracy," is the first one treated. His biography is traced, his writings are brought into focus, his capacities as a teacher receive attention, and his adherence to all that was democratic in opposition to vested interests is made manifest. Jefferson, Lincoln, and Wilson were his ideals. Other Jeffersonian Republicans and Democrats found places on his "honor roll"—Spencer Roane, John Taylor, Nathaniel Macon, John C. Calhoun, Jefferson Davis. There were contradictions in Dodd; Stephenson gives his interpretations of them. Two of the author's conclusions are illustrative of many more: "Whether he was writing about statesmen of the Old South or the new, the southern colonies in the seventeenth century or the United States of the 1920's, the same democratic yardstick was applied to men, measures, and institutions." "But the man himself was greater than his works, for he was a symbol of those qualities which middle-class Americans have come to look upon as a heritage. The closing sentence of his *Natianiel Macon* is equally applicable to the biographer: *'He actually believed in Democracy.'*"

Ulrich B. Phillips, "Historian of Aristocracy," and the author's own major professor in the days of his doctoral studies at Michigan, is treated sympathetically but with objectivity and scrutiny. Why was Phillips, who wrote so much Southern history, the "Historian of Aristocracy?" Perhaps a reading of his greatest work, *Life And Labor In The Old South*, supplies a clue. While Phillips knew the physical South as perhaps no other writer, and possessed "a knowledge of the human geography" of the South, he narrowed his concepts too much. His research into plantation records, for example, with the result that his writings included so much about the planter and slavery, never permitted him more than "brief excursions into the history of nongentry classes." It was that Phillips had an "overweening interest in the planter aristocracy and its human and physical property." His theme of Southern history—white supremacy—was correct, Stephenson holds, but having formulated his concepts "within a decade after he attained the doctorate," Phillips was unaware that "a new scholarship repudiated racial inferiority." In the words of the author, "Despite imperfections and imbalance, the static view was a contribution, for it presented aspects of southern history theretofore unexploited and it relegated to limbo much that had passed for history of the South in the preceding generation."

An essay on Walter Lynwood Fleming, "Historian of Conservatism," rounds out the volume. More of a student of Reconstruction than the ante-bellum South, and in such a book, for example, as *The Sequel of Appomattox*, there resulted "an interpretation by a member of the conservative school, whose work has subsequently been modified by historians who assign the Negro a more constructive role in the turbulent events of the sixties and seventies." A significant debt is owed Fleming for his writings on the Reconstruction era, but because he was unable to "free himself from the conservative milieu in which he grew up," many of his views cannot be sustained by current opinions. Nevertheless, Stephenson asserts, Fleming's contributions "must also be measured in terms of the climate of opinion in which he labored."

The flavor of this book lingers on. It must be read for all that cannot be sketched in a brief review.

DALLAS C. DICKEY,
University of Florida

THE LIVING LINCOLN. THE MAN, HIS MIND, HIS TIMES, AND THE WAR HE FOUGHT. Reconstructed From His Own Writings. Edited by Paul M. Angle and Earl Schenck Miers. New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press, 1955; pp. 673. $6.95.

The authors of this volume acknowledge their immense indebtedness to the definitive eight-volume *Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln*, published in 1953 under the editorship of Roy P. Basler. The book is essentially a one-volume adaptation of the *Collected Works*. Whether such a selection from a man's letters and speeches may be said to be (as the publishers claim) an "autobiography" is perhaps open to question, yet it seems likely that this indirect, unintentional self-portrait is as close as we shall ever come to a book-length autobiography of Abraham Lincoln. Angle and Miers have wisely kept their editorial comment to a minimum, thus allowing the book to be as nearly as possible Lincoln's own. The writings are presented chronologically in a series of chapters representing successive periods in Lincoln's life i.e., "Early Years in Springfield," "National

Emergence," "The Irrepressible Conflict," etc.). The book is tied together by concise introductions to each chapter and by a slender thread of narrative and running commentary which are brief enough to be unobtrusive, and yet sufficient to provide continuity and an occasional bit of helpful supplementary information. For example, when Lincoln offers to pay for twenty-five dollars' worth of furniture to help an impecunious friend, a terse footnote informs the reader, "He did."

The device of delineating character by means of speeches delivered and letters written while great events were taking place has unique advantages. It becomes possible, for instance, to trace the development of Lincoln's oratory from the florid, youthful exuberance of his Lyceum address in 1838 to such stately poetic utterances as the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural. And it is possible to achieve a personal participation in the mounting frustration and despair reflected in President Lincoln's communications with his generals (while marvelling at the magnificent patience displayed therein), and ultimately to share triumphantly in the profound sense of relief evident in those almost pathetic letters of appreciation to Grant and Sherman after he had found someone upon whom he could depend.

This is not, of course, the first one-volume collection of Lincoln's letters and speeches. Perhaps the best of the earlier collections is Roy P. Basler's *Abraham Lincoln: His Speeches and Writings* (1946), with which *The Living Lincoln* may profitably be compared. Basler's task was much the more difficult since he was forced to search out the original manuscripts, while Angle and Miers needed only to make an imaginative abridgment of the thoroughly authenticated *Collected Works*. Approximately 200 pages, or somewhat less than one-third, of *The Living Lincoln* is devoted to speeches, and the remainder to letters, telegrams, and editorial material; Basler devotes considerably more space to speeches than to letters, and in all cases gives complete texts. Despite the difference in emphasis apparently reflected in this allotment of space, each book can be useful in its own way to the student of oratory. This is perhaps best illustrated by reference to their handling of the Lincoln-Douglas debates. In a chapter entitled "These Poor Tongues," by judicious selection and cutting, supplemented by editorial paraphrase and summary, Angle and Miers manage to present in some forty pages a neat epitome of the seven debates. Basler, on the other hand, simply presents the first debate at Ottawa in its entirety—including verbatim reports of both men's speeches and the original reporter's notes on audience interruptions. Each kind of treatment has value; that treatment is "best" which best suits the particular purposes of the reader.

The Living Lincoln is a representative collection of the man's most self-revealing statements, selected and elucidated by an eminent Lincoln scholar and a student of the Civil War period. Read as a supplement to such biographies as those by Sandburg, Thomas, and Randall, it adds depth and color to the portrait of the greatest American.

BARNET BASKERVILLE,
University of Washington

N. F. S. GRUNDTVIG: AN AMERICAN STUDY. By Ernest D. Nielsen. Rock Island, Illinois: Augustana Press; pp. 173. $2.75.

This slender volume properly deserves at least three reviews, one from the theological point of view, one with the historical approach, and finally, one which is speech-oriented. Had Dr. Nielsen explored the total length and breadth of Bishop Grundtvig, one might have added the literary, the philosophical, the educational, the socio-economic, and the political considerations, for Grundtvig not only lived nearly nine decades, but his influence extended into every facet of Danish life.

Regardless of which aspect of Grundtvig is explored, one common thread pervades all and links all together, "freedom of choice." It is this note which gives Dr. Nielsen's study its special significance for modern Americans, even though the central figure lived in Denmark through most of the nineteenth century (1783-1872). Perhaps better than any other person, Grundtvig saw the place of speech in wise choices within freedom. He was not a radical who cast overboard all of the past; indeed, he leaned heavily on the past for guidance into the future. The past which most concerned him was that which was indigenous. He saw the retelling of Great Nordic mythology as a means of inspiring his people. He saw freedom of choice as a necessary condition for the spiritual penetration of the Gospel. Luther's living conception of the Word was echoed and emphasized. The Church could have its real influence, as he saw it, through "the Living Word."

Those who base their Christianity solely on the Bible may quarrel with Grundtvig as interpreted by Dr. Nielsen. Grundtvig's basic concept is expressed thus: "Christianity and the

Bible . . . are inseparable, but not identical." The word is the revelation of the spirit of religion, and its impact on human life requires the ability to speak it well. Dr. Nielsen rightly interprets Grundtvig when he says, "The printed word is, figuratively and contemptuously speaking, nothing but a corpse." Emphasis is placed on the point that the Sacraments, baptism, and the Holy Communion, for example, have no meaning unless they are spoken or heard.

Speech people will find great comfort and support, yes, great inspiration and stimulation in this little book. The religionist may be inspired or irritated, depending on his point of view, but at least he will find it thought provoking. The book is obviously adapted from a thorough doctoral dissertation, but excellent typographical treatment by the Augustana Press in addition to a dynamic literary treatment by Dr. Nielsen, has provided a most readable book.

P. Merville Larson,
Texas Technological College

MAIN STREET ON THE MIDDLE BORDER. By Lewis Atherton. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1954; pp. xix+423. $6.00.

Graduate students from Missouri University's Department of Speech have long known Professor Lewis Atherton as a teacher-historian who is sympathetic with their detailed research of newspapers, manuscripts, and diaries in a total effort to produce effective rhetorical criticism of the speechmaking of specifically chosen periods of time in Missouri history. Those who have been, for example, enrolled in Atherton's seminar on History of the South were most interested in his earlier volume, *The Southern Country Store, 1800-1860.* Now, in *Main Street on the Middle Border,* a cultural and economic history of midwestern towns from 1865 to 1950, the author again discloses, with marked accuracy, the significant material which can be discovered about life; he vividly underscores his observation that life and history are one and the same.

The Introduction indicates an attempt to read all reminiscences, autobiographies, and novels depicting the region and period; the scope of the work supports the author's contention that personal examination was given to ". . . virtually all the magazine articles and scholarly studies on my subject." That student who has spent endless hours in investigation of old newspaper files or who has peered wearily at a microfilm reader can appreciate other aspects of Professor Atherton's research. He spot-checked at least one country newspaper in each of the eight states totally included in the region of study; he used nothing from newspaper sources which was not confirmed in more than one paper.

Atherton defines the Middle Border as Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa and the eastern agricultural fringe of Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas. He sketches the country town in terms of function; towns which basically provide a service center for farmers have been included although the general examination focuses on places with less than 5,000 population. An effort is made to deal primarily with towns outside the range of standard metropolitan districts as they were delineated by the 1950 census. A careful reader can accept Atherton's statement that his "only excuse for lapses from the general scheme of selection and handling of material rests on paucity of records and an awareness . . . of the dangers involved in such departures."

Although the author was consciously trying to avoid writing history as he remembered it, thereby eliminating personal experiences and uttered tradition of family living in early Ohio and Missouri, it is pleasantly apparent that a depth of personal background aided in judgment of records and experiences of others. This book details the history and thoughts of other towns and families, but it lives more meaningfully because Atherton has exploited the parallels with what he and his family saw and experienced in their own midwesten communities, particularly Bosworth, Missouri.

The work is organized into ten chapters; we start with "Early Days on the Middle Border" and conclude with "Progress—Hopes and Realities." The concise, lucid style is enlivened with wonderfully descriptive passages that are vividly illustrative of the movement of time. In one intriguing section we read of Louis Bromfield's defense of lads' learning about life in the livery stable: ". . . small boys who learned of sex in such places gained a more wholesome attitude than those who listened to whispered stories in YMCA locker rooms." The origin and rise of the general store, the influence of churches, the excitement of the visiting circus, the country fair, the opera house, the importance of Chautauqua—all are aptly described in language of power and color. A wealth of source material, thoughtfully selected by a careful author, makes the

chronology of this history come alive for the contemporary reader.

The discussion of Chautauqua is entertaining; an early citation emphasizes the wholesome cleanliness of Chautauqua when it was enjoying greatest popularity. A traveling company presented scenes from *Carmen* in a Kansas community; the girls were working in a dairy instead of a cigarette factory and Carmen entered carrying a milk pail. Naturally, the riders of the Chautauqua circuit had messages; the orators spoke eternal truths in speeches labeled "Community Deadheads," "The Tragedy of the Unprepared," "The Man Who Can," and "The High Cost of Low Living." Atherton suggests that Chautauqua was sound psychologically in giving dedicated parents a feeling of happiness and worth as they struggled to boost their children one step farther up the ladder toward realization of the dream of opportunity.

Today's changing society has caused the author to decry the loss on the part of the individual of that feeling of belonging to the community as a whole. He notes that fragmentation of social life is a required part of atomic age adjustment; with this we can not quarrel. We can note throughout these pages a real affection for that which though richly described is no longer present.

Atherton's important book combines social history with suitable literary reference, the latter being underscored by competent and thorough research. *Main Street on the Middle Border* contains vibrant, significant commentaries on a contributory part of America. Pages 359-412 present detailed appendices and notes for the text.

At the time of publication Professor Atherton expressed the hope that his would be accepted as an honest book. It is certainly this; and it is a scholarly work as well. Anyone having an interest in history, whether of events or public address, will want to know about the many main streets of America's Middle Border.

A. L. THURMAN, JR.,
Michigan State University

TRIUMPH OF THE EGGHEADS. By Horace Coon. New York: Random House, 1955; pp. 400. $4.00.

In 1954 Adlai Stevenson accepted the epithet *egghead* which had been thrown at him. In a Harvard speech he latinized an aphorism, "The way of the egghead is hard." In so doing he diminished the derisiveness of the figure and helped establish it as a concept. Under a catchy title associated with Stevenson, Mr. Coon has traced the role of the intellectual in American politics. An egghead has two characteristics: (1) "The true mark of the egghead," he says, is "faith in intelligence"; (2) The egghead believes "that intelligence is the most effective instrument for social change," and "that you can achieve progress by appealing to men's reason."

Although the author sweeps through two centuries of American history with his nominations to and exclusions from the Egghead Elite, the bulk of the book is given to Jefferson, Wilson, F. D. Roosevelt, and Stevenson. Jefferson was "the archtype of the egghead in politics." Wilson, the "Scholar as Politician," explained the "triumph of the egghead" with his words, "'Ideas live, men die.'" Franklin Roosevelt was the "'real artist in government,'" perfector of Wilson's *New Freedom* and designer of the *New Deal*. Successor to Wilson and Roosevelt is Stevenson, heir apparent of the egghead dynasty, founder of the *"New Rationality."*

The egghead party is a minority party; the "eggheads have been few and far between." But their hope is that "after a series of routineers, the populace turns in a crisis to an egghead." To be included in Mr. Coon's roster, Democratic propensities seem to be an asset; no Republican made it. But Democrat and Egghead are not synonymous; Grover Cleveland is read out of the party as a "conservative Republican," Jackson as an anti-intellectual, and Bryan as a "spellbinder."

The style of the book is racy, with facile characterization. It must be read with its purpose in mind, which is "interpretation, not research." All the materials, the author notes, "are available in any large library." There is little documentation, and much drawing upon popular biographies. It must be read, too, with a steady pulse. The tone of the language is inflammatory: "partisan editors released their innate hysteria" against Wilson; against him, "Lodge's vindictiveness bordered on the psychopathic."

Since the book is highly selective in facts and partisan in interpretations, one could quarrel with fact or interpretation on any page. For example, using secondary and tertiary sources, the author describes Theodore Roosevelt as the "perennial Boy Scout," with "thinking notable for its adolescence." This judgment is drawn obviously from the less laudatory parts of Henry Pringle's life of Roosevelt. That TR was something of an egghead himself, that

he read and wrote all his life, that he drew upon the best intellectual sources available when he was in office, are ignored. For another example of looseness in fact and interpretation, one might select the election of Stevenson as Governor of Illinois in 1948. Coon writes that with "The odds against him," he "organized an aggressive group, made several speeches a day," and that "downstate counties, which had not gone Democratic in years, swept him into office." The implication that Stevenson had magnetic appeal ignores the actual situation. Jacob Arvey's upstate Democratic machine was working well that year, and the incumbent Governor who was running for re-election was unpopular even with Republicans.

Mr. Coon is a popular writer on hobbies, vacations, English, and Speech. Attention is given to speeches and speechmaking. The short description of Wilson's western tour for the League is dramatically told. Although the book is essentially pamphleteering in an election year, it contains many quick, clear portrayals, and it re-emphasizes and traces an important idea, the place of intelligence in politics, especially in the rhetoric of politics. At a time when we are all but resigned to mass attacks of mass media at the lowest common denominator of human appeal, a book dedicated to the principles of reason and intelligence in human affairs, even the egghead variety, has its value.

RICHARD MURPHY,
University of Illinois

SPECULATIVE INSTRUMENTS. By I. A. Richards. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955; pp. 216. $4.50.

Perhaps it is time for a comprehensive, analytical look at I. A. Richards' treatment of the problem of communication—for an essay in sorting, synthesis, and interpretation; a kind of trial-balance such as Marie Hochmuth drew up (*QJS*, 38 [1952], 133-44) from the theorizing of Kenneth Burke. The volume before us suggests the propriety of such an effort, but it provides less occasion, in fact, than almost any other book of Richards' which one might name. The eighteen pieces here brought together appear to be for the most part incidental off-shoots of Richards' "public" occupations of the past decade. Two or three are previously unpublished essays; others are reprints in whole or in part of articles and reviews, of notes for lectures or discussions. Most of them fall into the loose category of discourse about discourse, and in most of them the habituated Richardsian will find reminiscence, modification, and extension of familiar themes and methods. One cannot rightly recommend this book, however, to one who would begin an acquaintance with Richards. Such a one will encounter again and again highly rewarding sentences, and he will come upon paragraphs of deep insight, but he is likely to feel that he has entered too late in the conversation and cannot catch up.

Richards operates in the area of criticism, semantics, and rhetoric, for the most part simultaneously as one must. From such a piece as VI, "The Resourcefulness of Words," the rhetorician, for example, will resharpen his understanding of the Platonic principle that, since public address must always adapt and simplify toward truth, the speaker must know the best that can be known of the possible wrong simplifications which lurk in the instruments of communication. This knowledge, says Richards, awaits only the discovery, for "Few people ever commit a new and original misunderstanding."

At the present time the prevalence of wrong methods in literary analysis and interpretation is not so much the misfortune of popular and academic criticism as the absence of any method, unless it be the irrelevant application of scientific scholarship to matters of choice and value. Hence, if one wishes, one may take some comfort from Richards' oblique concessions to Renaissance rhetoric in his review of D. L. Clark's *Milton at St. Paul's School* and Sister Miriam Joseph's *Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language*, reprinted from the *Kenyon Review (XV "The Places and the Figures")*. The comfort, however, will be small.

Other pieces which your reviewer found more rather than less interesting are: I "Notes toward an Agreement between Literary Criticism and some of the Sciences," III "Emotive Meaning Again," IV "The Future of the Humanities," and IX "The Idea of a University." Faced with the monstrous resources for the destruction of language as an intellectual instrument which the mass media of communication possess, we may well conclude that "respect for the language" poses the central problem of the humanities today—not language as a "code," but language as "the supreme organ of the mind's self-ordering growth." This is still Richards' theme. Would that the glass were clearer.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

ENGLISH RELIGIOUS DRAMA OF THE MIDDLE AGES. By Hardin Craig. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1955; pp. vii+421. $6.75.

Teachers of English drama have long felt the need for a concise history of medieval English drama. Students, especially the beginning students, are often more puzzled than enlightened by the magnificent but difficult riches of Karl Young's *The Drama of The Medieval Church* (Oxford University Press, 1933) in two large volumes, which is essentially a thesaurus of liturgical drama and does not include the later developments after drama divorced itself from liturgy. Chambers' earlier monumental work in two volumes, *The Medieval Stage* (Oxford University Press, 1903) includes, naturally, none of the later developments of scholarship which have been so rich since the date of its publication, and is essentially a work for the mature scholar. The vast body of important scholarly works on English medieval drama in various European languages is so widely scattered that it is difficult to send young students to this important source. Hardin Craig, that esteemed scholar and beloved teacher who has made so many contributions to English Renaissance scholarship, has by the preparation and publication of *English Religious Drama of The Middle Ages* rendered a great service to his colleagues and earned the gratitude of future students.

After a splendid "Introduction" on the thought and culture of the Middle Ages, the book contains ten chapters, as follows: I. "Origin of the Religious Drama. Plays of the Resurrection and the Passion"; II. "Range and Extent of Liturgical Drama—The Christmas Cycle, The Plays of the Patriarchs, of Eschatology, and of Saints. Other Plays"; III. "Transitional Period"; IV. Medieval Religious Drama in England. The Medieval Stage"; V. "Introduction to the Study of the English Religious Drama in the Middle Ages. The Chester Plays"; VI York-Wakefield Plays"; VII. "The Hegge Plays. Religious Drama at Lincoln"; VIII. "Single Mystery Plays and Parts of Cycles"; IX. "Miracles and Moralities"; X. "The Reformation, the Renaissance, and the Medieval Religious Drama." The book concludes with a well-selected Bibliography and an excellent Index.

In his Preface and in numerous footnotes Craig acknowledges his indebtedness to Chambers, Young, Adams, Gardiner, Frank, and a host of other scholars; but this book is not a mere stringing together in summary form of the findings of earlier writers. It is a work of superb synthetic scholarship, interpreted and distilled through the wisdom of a great scholar and teacher. Through his rich experience and mature study, through his understanding of the later developments that come out of the medieval drama, through his wide knowledge of the middle ages and the Renaissance, through his keen understanding of the place of drama, first, in the liturgy of the medieval church and, later, in the theatre, through his appreciation of the powers and effects of drama upon audiences, and through his full understanding of the problems that puzzle the student and reader of medieval religious drama, Hardin Craig is ideally suited to the preparation of this much-needed book. His accomplishment may be summed up by saying that this latest Craig book is prepared and written in the usual superb Craig manner.

HUBERT HEFFNER,
Indiana University

FREUD ON BROADWAY: A HISTORY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS AND THE AMERICAN DRAMA. By W. David Sievers. New York: Hermitage House, 1955; pp. 479. $5.00.

"Ja, aber de Dichter haben das immer gekannt!"

This ambitious study explores at length Freud's assertion that "the poets have always known" and utilized principles which psychoanalytic investigations merely rediscovered for the present century. Professor Sievers has limited his survey to plays written for and performed on the professional American stage during the past fifty years or so. From an editorial standpoint, his marshaling of comprehensive biographical and historical materials into a clear, readable format is creditable work. Evaluated for its critical content, however, *Freud on Broadway* must at many points be pronounced deficient.

While discussing Hellman's *The Autumn Garden* Sievers provides a helpful key toward psychoanalytic poetics: "Although Freudian interpretation can help to explain it, it cannot give the play the dynamic plot development it lacks." So long as this point of view is maintained, *Freud on Broadway* is critically sound; but the author appears oftentimes reluctant to commit himself on matters of dramatic structure. His evident desire to maintain an objective attitude toward plays which he discusses often leads him to devote equal attention to meretricious pot-boilers as to dramas of merit. The peculiar nature of his

subject, further, requires him to deal with *any* exploitation of sex on the stage, simply because producers have frequently been clever enough to cash in on interest in Freud (later, in Kinsey) as a fad.

Sievers ventures perhaps his keenest critical evaluations concerning Philip Barry's genuinely Freudian "psychodramas." Here, he passes negative judgments upon a portion of this dramatist's stagecraft, though Barry's grasp of Freudian psychology is firm and his indebtedness to Freud significant. The author's balanced critical treatment of Elmer Rice's plays is also notable in this respect. Incisive analyses in Chapter XI, which covers Behrman, Osborn, and Raphaelson, serve to point up the growing value of Freud's studies to dramatic literature. "All three playwrights," Sievers observes, "have found the drawing room comedy a flexible vehicle for psychological unmasking." And he proves no less acute in his comments on psychiatry's potentialities in farce, which he illustrates by citing Dr. Brubaker's wonderful admonition in *The Seven Year Itch:*

> Until you are able to commit a simple criminal assault, I strongly advise you to avoid anything so complex as murder. One must learn to walk before one can run.

When Sievers takes up Saroyan's dramas, however, he becomes so engrossed in sniping at this playwright's personality (dissatisfaction is evidenced at Saroyan's somewhat abrupt reply to Sievers' questionnaire), he does far less than justice to his art ("Saroyan's closet dramas"), which often has been strongly, *successfully* "Freudian."

Eugene O'Neill, a major figure in *Freud on Broadway,* is treated at length, but not so satisfactorily as one might wish. *Strange Interlude's* remarkable characters the author finds "appealingly normal and identifiable"; and *The Iceman Cometh* is dubbed by him "this cheerless picture of human frailty." *Mourning Becomes Electra,* in Sievers' words, "belongs with the Greeks, Shakespeare, and Goethe"—a panegyric which seems hastily conceived and, as regards dramatic structure, of doubtful accuracy (Sievers elsewhere indulges in a singular comparison, to Jonson's *Volpone,* of Hellman's *The Little Foxes:* "... in a dramatic structure superior to anything achieved by the rare Elizabethan for all his devotion to Plautus and Terence"). O'Neill's troublesome paradox of "Freudian tragedy," on the other hand, is nowhere explored—though Sievers might conceivably have introduced this problem into his text.

The author's failure to provide a satisfactory definition of "tragedy" within his Freudian milieu raises doubts as to whether any such definition is possible. He cites *Death of a Salesman* as the work which "may prove to be the finest American tragedy thus far in the twentieth century." But he supplies only fragmentary and contradictory evidence that *Salesman* is not, in Professor Gassner's terms, merely *drame bourgeois:*

> True, there is no *anagnorisis,* no recognition by the tragic hero of the reason for his downfall. . . . But the *anagnorisis* is there, and is given instead to Biff, who is purged of his father-hostility when he comes to see his father for what he is.

One recognizes the familiar confusion between tragic *anagnorisis* and dramatic irony—which, though powerful in its theatric effects, *still is not tragic.* Sievers' concluding estimate of Willy Loman, therefore, as one who "cannot help but be a tragic figure when viewed through the eyes of his sons," is unconvincing.

"But there is an escape from the dilemma," the author insists, concerning a play by Tennessee Williams:

> Modern psychoanalytic psychology suggests a reinterpretation of Aristotle that restores *Streetcar* to the rank of tragic drama and at the same time confirms the universal insight of the observant Stagirite. It is simply that although Blanche closes her mind to any awareness as she escapes to psychosis, the insight happens *to the audience.*

This is fancy foot-work indeed; but Sievers' bland employment of "simply" does not obtain. Had *Cat On A Hot Tin Roof* been available to him in manuscript before his book went to press, he might have revised substantially his estimate of Williams and, more particularly, of the potentialities of Freudian drama.

Freud on Broadway is the product of tremendous energy and much painstaking scholarship. If its author has not always resolved the thorny problems which clog his complex history, he is to be thanked for having at least called attention to them. Sievers' study never was intended to close the subject; grateful readers will acknowledge it a stimulating point of departure.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.
Colorado School of Mines

TOWN HALL TONIGHT. By Harlowe R. Hoyt. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955; pp. 292. $7.50.

Wisconsin seems to hold a lien on "grass-roots theatre." Robert Gard's book of last year bore that title, and this year Harlowe Hoyt's history of theatricals in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, is subtitled "Intimate Memories of the Grassroots Days of the American Theatre."

Hoyt's account of the "country theatre of the eighties and nineties" is dished up in a kind of potpourri of remembered incidents of his grandfather's Concert Hall. Allowing his story to boil up out of the memory, gives the book a pervasive vividness and color, but the reader who requires chronological hitching posts, or who would like interpretation and evaluation, will be disappointed. Not only is the chronology vague within the last two decades of the century which he purports to treat, but again and again theatrical events are described as occurring "just after the Civil War." Amateur entertainments, chautauqua lecturers, medicine shows, trapeze artists, minstrels, and the dramatic thrillers from the standard repertory, all get relatively equal attention. The student who wishes to discover which were the backbone in the theatrical life of a small town of the period and which were peripheral and fleeting fancies, gets little help from Hoyt.

As is to be expected, the author's memory has not always retained full information. The descriptions of the Concert Hall, of particular performances, and of visiting companies offer the kind of firsthand impressions that pull them from their antique limbo, but unfortunately Hoyt's nostalgic remembrances are often insufficiently detailed. What he sees in his mind's eye is undoubtedly fully developed, in focus, and in full range color, but many sections of the picture that reach the reader are out of focus and underdeveloped.

The rich panoply of illustrations supply some of the missing details, and they certainly give the book the look of an up-to-date twentieth-century documentary history. But on the whole the volume belongs more properly with the nineteenth-century stage reminiscences, those personal recollections that seem so inviting and yet prove so annoying to the serious theatre student. As in these nineteenth-century rhapsodic accounts, extraneous details receive unwarranted attention. For example, Hoyt's digressive descriptions of theatrical events in the metropolitan centers, although fascinating in themselves, force the reader to keep a sharp eye to learn that these productions never arrived at the Beaver Dam Concert Hall.

But these reservations aside, if one rides along with Hoyt through his memory book, there are plenty of lively sights to see: "The Brownies in Fairyland," The Hutchinson Singers, the Forepaugh Wild West Combination, the Uncle Si Shows, and Major R. H. Hendershot, the original "Drummer Boy of the Rappahannock."

Most of these entertainments disappeared from the small town scene shortly after the turn of the century, but as his Uncle Bee pointed out to Hoyt, perhaps not all have disappeared completely. "I have just been catching sight now and then of this new television stuff. I used to wonder what had happened to those medicine men who played Beaver Dam. Now I know. They have decked themselves out in barber's coats and are passing themselves off as physicians and dentists endorsing toothpaste, cigarettes, and hair tonic."

RICHARD MOODY,
Indiana University

THE MUTUAL FLAME: ON SHAKESPEARE'S *SONNETS* AND *THE PHOENIX AND THE TURTLE*. By G. Wilson Knight. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1955; pp. xi+233. $3.75.

It is always doubtful whether Mr. Knight's particular interest is the writer about whom he happens to be writing, or Mr. Knight's own view of the world and of genius. The present book is ostensibly about certain aspects of Shakespeare's work, but so much else comes into play that one is forced to think of the subject as being ultimately not Shakespeare but rather the psychology of poetic creativity. Summary of the argument is a thorny undertaking.

Of this real subject, much is said; and much that is said is stimulating and suggestive. But in the last analysis, the volume casts a studied darkness rather than light upon the particular works of Shakespeare which it seeks to illumine, and Shakespeare is lost in Mr. Knight's familiar world of symbols where integration patterns flash fitfully through all things.

Part I (the greater half) of the book is devoted to the *Sonnets*. After reviewing current arguments about date, dedication, and personalities within the poems, Mr. Knight wisely refuses to "settle any of these problems in factual and biographical terms," (p. 11) though he thinks the *experience* behind the sonnets

to be early in Shakespeare's career. Instead, he discusses the poems "as a semi-dramatic expression of a clearly defined process of integration pointing towards the realization of a high state of being . . ." (p. 23). The problems involved—as always for Mr. Knight—are time, death, and eternity. The particular interest in the *Sonnets* is the bisexuality of genius which permits to it "the awareness, and expression, of planes, or dimensions, beyond the biological and the temporal." (p. 69). It is the Dionysian surge beneath the Apollonian logic to which he devotes his most concentrated attention; and the "kinetic, energic, Dionysian movement; the heave of its ocean, its swell and crests" (p. 98) is at the heart of the *Sonnets* as it is at the heart of the dramatic technique. "In matters small and vast alike, this is the typifying Shakespearian form. . . ." (p. 99).

Mr. Knight does not object to the term *homosexual* for the poet's attachment to the boy, as it appears in the poems, though he expressly points out that his interest is poetic rather than biographical, and that he is interested in the "non-sexual, yet sexually impregnated, adoration." (p. 127). Out of this "bisexual image of the Fair Youth" (p. 138) arose an inward bisexuality within the poet's soul-mind; this "higher, supersexual, integration," (p. 125) which appeared to the poet almost like an illness, was "an insight into the eternal meaning of the creative process," (p. 139) and from it the playwright did all he could do—he created "love-plays and king-plays." (p. 139). Thus:

> The great dramas were composed from a bisexual understanding. They can, indeed, be widely defined in terms of the sexes, since we have either the bringing together of the sexes in romance, or the interweaving of masculine and feminine, which are the Apollonian and the Dionysian, principles in the Histories and the Tragedies. Feminine pathos is subjected to suffering by masculine action, or the tragic hero is overthrown by some feminine, and cosmic, invader. Dramatically, this interweaving labours for the fusion of power-with-love, or strength-with-grace. That is a, perhaps the, main result of Shakespearian drama." (p. 139).

Part II goes on to examine the metaphysical problems posed by the *Sonnets* through the symbolism of the Phoenix.

WALLACE A. BACON,
Northwestern University

THE ART OF THE PLAY: AN ANTHOLOGY OF NINE PLAYS. By Alan S. Downer. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1955; pp. xi+451. $6.00.

It is Professor Downer's thesis that "a playwright's work must be approached through the theatre of his time." *The Art of the Play* is a combination anthology and text which attempts to implement that concept by consideration of three main kinds of theatre. The first of these is the "focussed playhouse" of the Greek *orchestra,* in which there is visual unity and intensification of effect made possible by the grouping of the audience on three sides of the central shrine in the dancing circle. In this theatre Downer describes the hypothetical first drama as Thespis in the role of King Pentheus detaches himself from the chorus to dispute with the leader, who plays Dionysus. The descriptive imagery makes it possible for the reader to participate in the birth of drama and to sense the excitement of the Greek theatre. The play that follows, *Prometheus Bound,* in the excellent Edith Hamilton translation, is better evaluated in terms of this focussed playhouse.

The second theatre form Downer calls the "panoramic playhouse," as represented by the Elizabethan multi-acting-area theatre. *Doctor Faustus* is the illustrative play, although the Shakespearean playhouse does not come to life quite as vividly as does the Greek. Nor does the theatre of mid-nineteenth century realism, as represented by Ibsen's *Ghosts.* Downer is more concerned with Ibsen's mastery of dramatic structure, and extends his analysis of the unity and dramatic action of *Ghosts* through several chapters, sidestepping the question of the datedness of the play in favor of a symbolic and universal interpretation.

If *The Art of the Play* is intended, as Downer suggests, for the beginner, one must question or at least express bewilderment at the choice and organization of materials. After the re-creation of the first drama of Thespis and a brief account of the *Quem Quaeritis* trope, is the beginner ready, one may wonder, for a perceptive reading of *Ghosts*? Or is he ready, after *Doctor Faustus,* to plunge without textual comment into *Antony and Cleopatra,* or to follow that—without any background material on the French theatre—with *Tartuffe*?

Part II begins with the statement that "During the first part of this book we have been, as it were, on stage, observing the actor as he moves and speaks, the director as he goes about his business, the designer as he responds to

the demands upon his art." Would that this were the case! It is precisely this material, however, which is missing. Professor Downer's flair is for penetrating literary analysis, and it would be ungracious not to recognize the merit of his extended discussions of allegory, metaphor, and symbolism in *Ghosts, Doctor Faustus,* and *Prometheus.* But the stated aim of approaching the plays through the theatre of their times has not been fully realized. If the original production of each play could have been made as vivid as the first play of Thespis, or if the reader could have been given a sense of the variety of styles and interpretations which great actors and directors have brought to these plays, Downer might have achieved his goal. If he were limited as to the number of photographs, for example, why include the four excellent likenesses of famous actors as Falstaff when no *Henry IV* or *Merry Wives* appears in the anthology?

The chapters on the modern drama come closer to fulfilling Downer's objective, treating in some detail the backgrounds of Chekhov and the Moscow Art Theatre, the drama of "signs and silences" of Maeterlinck, and the germs of non-representational theatre in the work of Strindberg and Hauptmann. With this preparation, the two final plays, *The Sea Gull* and *The Emperor Jones* are presented, each with a production photograph. Part III consists of two further plays presented without textual comment: Lope De Vega's *Fuente Ovejuna,* and *Oedipus Rex* in the Fitts and Fitzgerald translation.

One can only regret that Downer does not consider any play written subsequent to *The Emperor Jones* as worthy of inclusion. As the book stands, I should be at a loss to know for what course to recommend it. Although it is perhaps too mature for the general introductory course, there is much in it that is pertinent to the student of playwriting.

W. David Sievers,
Long Beach State College

CHILD DRAMA. By Peter Slade. Edited by Brian Way. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. 379. $10.00.

Mr. Slade has conjured up a world in which children form a special kind of civilization to which grown-ups come as missionaries to see how and why they play as they do and to teach them how to do best the things they want to do most. This is not wrong and yet I wonder if the point of Creative Dramatics as we know it in America, at least, is not lost in a clinical behavioristic analysis of the child. But Mr. Slade is speaking of England in his book and what he says makes very worthwhile reading even if we in America must disagree with much of it.

Mr. Slade follows the growth of drama in a human being from its "earliest creative speech (which) is a sort of babble, intermixed with outbursts of clearly intentional grunt, cry and scream . . . and the earliest creative movement of the hands and feet. . . ." Half of the book is devoted to the patterns of movement and the use of space that the child will make for himself and with a group as he develops his free expression. From this use of free play the child will develop an art form which is his own and which Mr. Slade labels "child drama."

The method of "child drama" is one which we know as "dramatic play"—improvisation triggered by a suggestion of a mood, a rhythm, a situation. With the older children it is the "play"—or the creative formal play—which will bring forth a true art form from the child. The purpose here is that there develops an art of acting typical to the behavior of the individual child.

The book explores further the subject of formal plays for children—what we call Childrens Theatre. It is a sin, according to Mr. Slade, for a child to witness a performance of a play especially produced for him by adults or anyone else for that matter. He is afraid that "the children copy these productions for long periods after and the copies get worse and worse: they lose confidence in their own ability to dress, make scenes and write plays." Mr. Slade is talking of a child in a vacuum, and if he is really sincere in creating art with the child, surely he will not deny him at least the opportunity of seeing the best sort of dramatic art. How can a person create without experiencing and observing the best of life—real or recreated for him. Certainly an adult actor will not avoid seeing a play because it might influence his style of acting. There is nothing disastrous about imitation—we learn through imitation. We are what we are because we are critical observers.

This is a contradictory book in the final analysis. I am not sure whether "Child Drama" is a form of "creative dramatics" or a method for acting. Perhaps it is both and is used as an all inclusive term for any expression a child may give with his voice and body.

There is much to criticize in this volume.

However there is one thing to which all of us on both sides of the ocean will agree—that the subject of theater with children is worth pursuing, studying, defining and practicing. We can be thankful to Mr. Slade for giving us his honest and sincere thoughts on the subject.

RICHARD G. ADAMS,
University of California, Los Angeles

ACTING IS BELIEVING. By Charles J. McGaw. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1955; pp. 177. $3.50.

Acting is Believing is the unacademic title Dr. McGaw has given his compact, professionally executed manual, which is described as "a basic method for beginners." The teacher of acting who believes (perhaps teaching is believing, too) that he can develop sensitive interpretative artists will welcome it. It is not for this reviewer to conjecture how many teachers of acting remain who approach the field as a creative art and determine to reach for the professional level. Those who deal with acting mostly as an extracurricular activity may consider "the method" somewhat esoteric and discursive. Afraid to desert the latter group completely in his text, Dr. McGaw teeter-totters between creative idealism and "how to do it" (with cartoons). The text therefore succeeds pragmatically as a kind of practical Stanislavsky, but fails as a complete orientation and explanation.

Enthusiasts of the Stanislavsky method of acting, admirers of Lee Strasberg (former teacher of the author) and fans of Actors Studio trainees Marlon Brando, Julie Harris, Karl Malden, the late James Dean, Montgomery Cliff, Shelley Winters, and recently acquired Marilyn Monroe will be especially eager to obtain copies or arrange for adoption of the text. Dr. McGaw comments that his manual should be considered as influenced by but not a key to the Stanislavsky system. The derivation is everywhere evident. The frontispiece photograph of Stanislavsky (costumed for "The Cherry Orchard") suggests that the volume is dedicated to him and the art for which he stood so brilliantly. Those who would wish to use his system (as modified) in a Beginning Acting course, particularly one devoted to scenes and impovisations, may find this manual more useful than Boleslavsky's "Acting, The First Six Lessons" (Theatre Arts Books, 1933) or Rosenstein's "Modern Acting" (Samuel French, 1937), both of which derive, also, from Stanislavsky's "An Actor Prepares" (Theatre Arts Books, 1936). McGaw's basic method appears to depend on the concept that "observation plus imaginary circumstances leads to action which leads to belief which leads to feeling." The volume is organized around this formula.

Dr. McGaw has included too much reference to Chekhov, perhaps because his dramas especially benefit by use of "the method" and vice versa. There are photographs of Ellen Terry, John Guilgud, Jean-Louis Barrault, and Laurette Taylor, all of whom would be rather surprised to find themselves pictured in this book, since with the possible exception of Miss Taylor, they employed what they doubtless considered a classic acting methodolgy (pre-Stanislavsky) rather than the psychological-naturalism of the new school. The Stanislavsky method, as Dr. McGaw points out, can be considered as presenting "the common denominator of good acting by anybody"—but other approaches to acting could perhaps make the same claim. There is, however, validity in the psychological emphasis of "the method" in training students, and a revival of interest in it is surely welcome. The sincerity and earnestness of "the method" trained actor (according to reliable reports) is impressive and refreshing—he will often refuse to play a role which he cannot completely understand and feel, demonstrating a true artist's integrity. The importance of the psychological, particularly as it involves the awakening and utilization of the student's senses in imagination, finds competent treatment in this manual. Teachers who can work creatively, intuitively, and sensitively with students will take to this approach eagerly. Teachers who are perplexed by "creativity" will find special assistance and guidance.

The cartoons by Mr. Reddy are more than adequate for their purpose but suggest a college newspaper rather than a text. The portraits previously mentioned are good but useless except perhaps as inspiration. Why not include studies of college productions?

The manual, as it stands, is a most vivid and stimulating volume. Dr. McGaw should have incorporated some current research in the field, used more appropriate illustrations, and perhaps improved upon material included for practice. But the acting manual is recommended as superior in its field to the majority in print.

JOHN ROBSON,
Kansas State College

STAGECRAFT FOR NONPROFESSIONALS. By F. A. Buerki. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1956; pp. 127. $1.50.

It is rare in these days of compromise books directed to several different, and often mutually exclusive, audiences, to find a text singularly aimed at the beginner which does just exactly what it sets out to do. This is just such a book. One may argue with the author's contention that there is no other adequate source for the information which he has compiled—this reader can think of several which at least claim to meet the specifications—but no one will deny that this is the most thorough text available for anything like this price. Nor does this imply that it is a slipshod affair. It has a paper binding, to be sure, but it is well and copiously illustrated and printed clearly on adequately heavy, if not deluxe, paper. It should certainly withstand the rigors of a semester or two in the hands of the average student.

The content of the book is rigidly scaled to the needs of the beginning amateur whose first need is one workable way of getting the show on. Furthermore, it is directed rather exclusively toward the production of the common realistic drama of the sort that may appear on most high school or even college stages. Emphasis is on realism, simplicity and economy. This is done at the expense of stimulating the imagination or challenging the ingenuity.

The experienced theatre artist will find many techniques that he does not consider good practice. He will also find some that seem outmoded, especially in the section on lighting. Mr. Buerki indicates in the preface that he is aware of these things and that he has done them in the name of simplicity. Some may argue that he has carried this too far in such things as simplifying the hinging of a parallel by allowing the corners to remain open instead of overlapping. Others may find his discussion of lighting circuits and equipment simplified by way of discussion of outdated equipment. Certainly, the more experimental of theatre workers will deplore the lack of any mention of theatrical forms other than the realistic, peep-hole proscenium type of production.

These should not be serious handicaps, however, to any imaginative theatre worker or instructor who is looking for a book that his workers can afford that will contain a maximum of factual data to help them along until the instructor can fill in the details. This is especially true for the high school or small amateur group who are struggling to get an idea of theatrical techniques.

The author deserves especial note for his line drawings, without which the book would lack clarity and concreteness. The use of these in place of photographs must have contributed much to the reasonable cost of this useful book.

WILLARD F. BELLMAN,
Washington University

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION, 1955. Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1955; pp. 274. $3.00.

The varied contents in this appropriately titled "symposium" on motivation are indicated by the major papers therein:

Maslow, Abraham: "Deficiency Motivation and Growth Motivation"

McClelland, David C.: "Some Social Consequences of Achievement Motivation"

Olds, James: "Physiological Mechanisms of Reward"

Peak, Helen: "Attitude and Motivation"

Young, Paul Thomas: "The Role of Hedonic Processes in Motivation"

Rotter, Julian B.: "The Role of the Psychological Situation in Determining the Direction of Human Behavior"

Something of value is added in the form of comments on each paper by two of the other authors. The reader will find that these notes add substantially to his understanding.

The Olds and Young articles report research in animal psychology. Olds demonstrates that electrical stimulation of certain sections of the brain of a rat produces reward-type responses. Young presents evidence that in rats as in humans affective states act as strong motives in directing and sustaining behavior. Olds hypothesizes a reward and a punishment section of the brain. Maslow in commenting upon Olds' research speculates upon the possibility that humans might learn to stimulate their reward centers electrically and thereby experience the purest of pleasures. Ethical implications here become intriguing.

The Peak and Rotter papers provide detailed analyses of internal psychological states and associated environmental determiners with their relationships to particular motivations. Each contributes interesting insights although

the language and style of the Peak article make for heavy going.

The liveliest and clearest writing occurs in the two remaining articles, both of which contribute theoretical materials that will ultimately change our approach to motivation in teaching speech. Maslow and McClelland attack the problem of describing behavior which is motivated by something other than the physiological imperatives. Both conclude the presence of dominant motive patterns not productive of drive satisfaction or tension reduction in human behavior.

McClelland describes "achievement" motivation, its measurement and its correlates in cultural context and other environment. No less than amazing is the relationship he reports between the Strong Vocational Interest Blank scores and his *n* Achievement scores. From a fairly specific study of a narrow motivation pattern McClelland derives a series of challenging speculations. His work suggests a new dimension for audience analysis in public and private speaking.

The Maslow paper undoubtedly outdoes even McClelland in speculation and is the most thoughtful and original contribution to this collection. Maslow develops a distinction between two fundamentally different kinds of motivation in the human being. *Deficit motivation* is a tension reduction phenomenon, necessary to the physical and mental "normalcy" of the individual. Without adequate satisfactions in this category, a person becomes physically ill or neurotic. *Growth motivation,* he contends, develops when the deficit needs are taken care of. "Growing up" ideally results in a minimizing of deficit considerations and an increasing preoccupation with growth patterns; in essence, enjoying experiences for their own sake. His term "self-actualization" embraces growth motivations. These enable one to utilize his talents more fully, to be creative, and to achieve psychic security.

Apparently the McClelland achievement motive is one small specific item in the Maslow panorama of growth motivations.

Maslow discusses brilliantly the implications of his findings. His data, at present, are largely clinical descriptions of self-actualized (growth-motivation-dominated) people. It all has a resounding ring of reasonableness. Growth motivation promises to fill a gap in the theory of persuasion which is now plugged approximately, uneasily, and temporarily by "derived motive" assumptions.

Finally, Maslow points the way to a new approach to ethics. A "science of values" might well result from the thoughtful combination of the concepts of self-actualization and growth motivation with considerations of social utility.

Certainly, theory of motivation is central to public speaking, argumentation, and persuasion. Probably, it is similarly important to rhetoric, interpretation, and drama. Motivational psychology is undergoing exciting and rapid evolution. This book will give the reader a quick overview of recent developments and a glimpse of changes to come.

WILLIAM S. HOWELL
University of Minnesota

GUIDANCE IN GROUPS: A RESOURCE BOOK FOR TEACHERS, COUNSELORS, AND ADMINISTRATORS. By Margaret E. Bennett. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955; pp. xi+411. $5.50.

Group work has become so popular in the last few years that every writer on educational subjects seems to feel compelled to make a bow in this direction. Such a bow is taken by Margaret Bennett, whose work finds its roots in the ever-growing area of educational guidance and counseling. *Guidance in Groups* is essentially an attempt to provide the professional guidance worker with the tools whereby he may articulate the traditional individual approach with group approaches.

Although the first chapter is entitled "The Place of Group Approaches in Guidance," one looks in vain for a clearcut list of comparative advantages for the group and the individual approaches. Bennett leaves the impression that group approaches are primarily useful when dealing with shared problems, as preparation for individual counseling, and as a means of economizing time and effort. Probably one of the reasons for this vagueness is the failure to specify kinds of group situations and the different treatments required by each kind of group. The author discusses groups ranging from discussions among two or three pupils with mutually shared problems of adjustment to home room classes dealing with vocational choices.

The bulk of the book is occupied with an account of the nature of guidance and guidance programs, together with a discussion of common kinds of guidance problems. Of the ten chapters, speech teachers and discussion workers would find three most interesting. In one Bennett traces an interesting historical account of the sources of the group approach in

guidance. In another, she rather hastily summarizes research in group techniques relying primarily upon the educational wing of the group dynamics movement. The third chapter of interest is the one in which she discusses group techniques for developing personality and interpersonal relationships.

The reader will note two facts of more than passing concern. The first is the absence of reference to the Rogerian school of nondirective therapy. The second is the author's ignorance of any work done in discussion by those in the field of speech. The professional guidance worker will doubtless find this book helpful in planning and executing a comprehensive guidance program in the school; the layman will find in this book a sound and stable understanding of the purpose and scope of guidance without having to wade through a morass of educational jargon; but neither will find much help in the actual techniques of working with people in group situations.

R. Victor Harnack,
University of Colorado

THE PRONUNCIATION OF ENGLISH IN AUSTRALIA. By A. G. Mitchell. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1955; pp. x+84. $1.50.

Taking "pronunciation" in the broad sense, Dr. Mitchell, Professor of English Language in the University of Sydney, has given an impressionistic description of the phonetic and other characteristics of Australian speech.

He suggests that it is "neither desirable nor necessary" to distinguish more than two "well-defined types: an educated, cultivated, professional speech and an uncultivated, popular speech." Notwithstanding his admission that education and professional status are not definitely related to the type of speech used, the author calls the first type "Educated Australian" and the other "Broad Australian." The latter, we are advised, is spoken by "over 70%" of Australians, although no evidence is presented to support the statement.

By the end of the book Dr. Mitchell has evidently forgotten that he established only two categories, for in phonetic transcriptions he provides a third type of speech, "Uneducated Australian." The transcriptions, incidentally, would have been of much greater value to readers if they had been of the same material.

The author states that he has hesitatingly used the term "Educated" since it suggests "exclusiveness." This, and the fact that the style of speech it is used to categorize is not determined by education, would suggest that another term might be preferable. The special usage of "Broad," meaning "popular," would argue against its acceptance. The terms "general" and "modified" are used in the text (pp. 13, 15, 26-7) and they immediately recommend themselves as more suitable.

Surely the speech of "70%" is General Australian speech, and that of those who "modify their speech away from Australian characteristics" (p. 15), is Modified Australian speech. The speech of migrants, marked as it is by their foreign dialects, is a third category. However, elsewhere, Dr. Mitchell has objected to this terminology.

Essentially the author distinguishes Educated Australian and Broad Australian by phonemic variations of some vowels and diphthongs. Educated Australian tends to substitute [aɪ] and Broad Australian substitutes [ʌɪ] for the Educated Southern British [eɪ].

Mitchell says that Australian speech is slow, nasal, high-pitched, "lip-lazy" and lacks the "deeper kind of resonance." These assertions are all based, as far as we can ascertain, on *one* speaker "whose pronunciation may be taken as representative." (p. 35). Their reliability is probably suggested by the size of the sample.

While acknowledgment is given for the provision of "instruments and facilities for research," no mention is made of any instrument except a gramophone. No reference is made to scholarly research. References are invariably to newspapers and novels.

The suggestion is made that the chief reasons for the development of an Australian dialect are linguistic, but none are explained.

Some "Practical Suggestions" for training in the production of Educated Australian vowels and diphthongs are provided. Van Riper would question their practicality.

The bibliography omits books quoted or cited in the text. Titles in the text, footnotes, and bibliography appear sometimes in italics and sometimes in quotes. The symbol [m] appears in a phonetic transcription on page 69 but is not in the List of Symbols Used, and the Educated Australian pronunciation of "which" is given as [witʃ].

Some Australian place names, including Melbourne ['mɛlbən], and words that are pronounced differently in England and Australia are given in phonetic symbols.

It is evident that a wide survey of Australian speech and a scientific, instrumental analysis of an adequate sample of it will have to be under-

taken before accurate statements can be made about its phonetics.

A. L. McLeod,
The Pennsylvania State University

CREDIT COURSES BY TELEVISION. Report of a Conference Sponsored Jointly by the Committee on Television of the American Council on Education, and Continuing Education Service, Michigan State College. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1955; pp. 49. $1.00.

This pamphlet contains the edited transcript of a two-day conference on telecourses held at the Kellogg Center, East Lansing, Michigan, February 21 and 22, 1955. The conference provided a meeting ground for the representatives, some forty in number, of most of the colleges now offering courses for credit by television.

In a Foreword to the volume, Arthur S. Adams, President of the American Council on Education, writes as follows:

"This conference offered the first opportunity for an exchange of experience on the part of those whose responsibility it has been to determine answers to such questions as: What courses should be offered? Who teaches them? How should enrollment procedures be handled? How should credit be recorded on the student's transcript? And what compensation or schedule adjustment should be made for the professor? While, as the report indicates, the answers to these questions vary widely, there does appear to be a consensus that television offers a sound way of expanding the central teaching function of the college or university without affecting adversely the quality of student work and without alteration of primary course objectives. . . . It appears that there is a significant audience whose interest is increased because what they see and hear has the academic validity of being a credit course. In addition there is a viewing audience which, surveys indicate, runs as high as 1,000 to 1 ratio over the credit registrants.

"All of these factors taken together point to the credit course offering as one important aspect of educational television, as one of the possible ways to meet increased enrollment demands, as a way of serving a large segment of the public not actually enrolled in our educational institutions, and as an important means of increasing public awareness of the nature and work of institutions of higher learning. In the light of these findings the American Council on Education publishes this report in the hope that the experience summarized here may serve as a helpful guide to other institutions. . . ."

The summarized experience—the transcript of the discussion itself—does prove a helpful guide to the thinking and experience of those actually working with this form of educational television. The discussions are stimulating, thought-provoking, and certainly informative. The facts brought out and the experiences described should be of inestimable value to administrators and producers who are contemplating the use of this avenue of education.

Not only do the discussions bring a challenging new area of educational exploration, but they reflect problems of execution that can now be anticipated and guarded against by others.

This is recommended material for anyone concerned. Although the reading of impromptu discussions may be found more cumbersome than a prepared text, the spontaneity of give-and-take is compensation. And it's vital because it's "written" by the pioneers themselves as they describe their experiences, their problems, their suggestions, and their hopes and expectations for the future.

Garrett L. Starmer,
Chico State College

AUDITIONING FOR TV. By Martin Begley and Douglas MacCrae. New York: Hastings House, 1955; pp. xvii+106. $3.50.

THE TELEVISION ACTOR'S MANUAL. By William Hodapp. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1955; pp. xv+349. $4.00.

Each of these books contains practical information and hints for the actor or actress seeking employment in television, but neither has sufficient substantive value to justify its recommendation as a text in a college course.

The authors recognize that there is no art of acting for television separate and apart from the art of acting on stage or screen. In the Foreword to his *Television Actor's Manual*, Hodapp remarks that "If the TV actor naively believes that the great directors on TV will necessarily give him training in his profession, he is mistaken. . . . The average director in TV expects talent to be already present in the actor in multiple ways to be called forth in the emergencies of the medium quickly and effortlessly." Accordingly, neither of the books attempts to teach television acting in itself. However, they do discuss some of the minor

ways in which one must adapt to the new medium.

While the books are written from somewhat different points of view, the material included is essentially similar. Begley and MacCrae in sixty pages draw upon their experiences as casting director and writer for NBC to make suggestions on the best approach to the audition situation. They emphasize the importance of first impressions, selection of materials, and conduct in the studio. They have very helpfully noted the mistakes most frequently made at auditions and how to avoid getting off to a poor start.

Mr. Hodapp is well known in television for his production of documentary programs and his excellent publications of the past. As a frequent visitor to college campuses, he is skilled in making suggestions to novices. Unfortunately, too much of his *TV Actor's Manual* is devoted to sample audition material and appendices. His observations on TV acting are excellent as far as they go, and the reader is truly disappointed to find forty pages of excellent material followed by more than four times as much space occupied by audition scripts.

The implication that there just isn't very much to write on TV acting per se is rather clear, and the authors are to be complimented for their acceptance of the limitation by not trying to expand their books more than they did.

Doubtless, the best use of these publications would be as a supplement to standard acting texts and courses. It also seems reasonable to suggest that every young actor should read the two books while on his train to New York or Hollywood as they will probably increase substantially the chances that someone in television will recognize whatever degree of talent he happens to possess.

EUGENE S. FOSTER,
Syracuse University

HOW TO WRITE FOR TELEVISION. Edited by William I. Kaufman. New York: Hastings House, 1955; pp. xii+95. $2.50.

This book is one of the series published by Hastings House in their "Communication Arts Books" series. William Kaufman, the editor of the book, has called upon ten professional writers in the field of television writing to record their impressions as to how to become a successful TV playwright.

A common fault of a book of this type is that it lacks unity. The authors even disagree over many points, such as for example the importance of dialogue in a script. However, this is to be expected. If there were an easy formula for writing that could be neatly read and followed, the producer would be flooded with "good" scripts.

The separate contributions of the book range from highly discouraging for the embryonic writer to mildly encouraging. All of the authors indicate that writing is a hard, difficult process requiring a sturdy typewriter, reams of paper, and the intestinal fortitude to open an envelop containing a rejection slip with the determination that the next one "will be my masterpiece."

Perhaps the best known of the contributors is Paddy Chayefsky, whose play "Marty" is cited several times. Other writers include script editors, programs supervisors, and producers.

The content of the book ranges from the highly practical, including Do's and Don'ts, to a comparison of the early Greek theatre with television Drama. Many aspects of television writing are included, among them how to develop dialogue, characterization, storyline, conflict, writing the live and filmed show, educational programs, series and unit productions, where to get ideas, and marketing the script.

In writing about educational programs John Latham cautions that people would rather be entertained than educated, and realizing this fact it is perhaps best to present educational programs over television in dramatic form. Eugene Burr suggests that those who would raise the "cultural level of the viewer" must follow the old recipe for rabbit stew: "First catch the rabbit." Most of the authors urge the writer-to-be that a good way to learn technique is by watching more and more television drama now on the air.

The book is highly readable and offers many good suggestions for the person looking to the field of television writing either as a vocation or an avocation.

HAROLD E. NELSON,
Pennsylvania State University

BRIEFLY NOTED

A GUIDE TO PARLIAMENTARY PAPERS: WHAT THEY ARE, HOW TO FIND THEM, HOW TO USE THEM. By P. and G. Ford. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955; pp. 79. $1.25.

The bulk of material which the scholar must handle in the study of British parliamentary speaking is so vast, so scattered, and

so undefined in quality that any assistance in shortening the time of mere search is indeed welcome. Hence one need hardly more than notice the existence of the latest of the little handbooks by Professor Ford of the University of Southampton and Mrs. Ford, composed as it is very compactly from long practical experience with using parliamentary papers and directing others in the use of them. In as much as the interests of the authors and of their students lie chiefly in economics and history, the special problems of the student of public address as distinguished from historian or economist are only indirectly taken into consideration. The *Guide* is limited to parliamentary papers, and includes no canvass of private and unofficial sources of light on parliamentary speaking. It will be most useful for the times from about 1800 to the present, and any investigator of parliamentary speaking, especially in the early 19th century, may profit from Appendix II, Notes on the Methods of Compilation, Accuracy, and Style of Hansard's *Debates*.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

LECTURES TO MY STUDENTS. By C. H. Spurgeon. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1955; pp. 443. $5.95.

Every serious student of public speaking will want to have a copy of Spurgeon's *Lectures to My Students* on his shelves. Spurgeon is one of the many nineteenth-century preachers who have enriched rhetorical theory. Spurgeon preached to 7,000 people Sunday morning and night for more than twenty years in his huge tabernacle which he built in London. In connection with his preaching he ran a school for preachers. These lectures are stenographic accounts of his talks in that school.

Of special interest to students of public speaking are the lectures on Attention; The Faculty of Impromptu Speech; Open Air Preaching; Posture, Action, Gesture; Earnestness: Its Marring and Maintenance; Illustrations in Preaching; Anecdotes from the Pulpit; The Uses of Anecdotes and Illustrations; Where Can We Find Anecdotes and Illustrations?; The Sciences as Sources of Illustrations.

These lectures have already provided one of our number for materials for a doctoral thesis. Now that they are available in this form more students of public speaking will find their value.

It is to be hoped that the publisher will find his venture rewarding and that he will make other series of lectures on preaching available not only to the ministry but to our profession as well.

LIONEL CROCKER,
Denison University

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL AS A PREACHER. By Archibald McLean. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1955; pp. 46. $1.00.

Alexander Campbell has been neglected in the history of American preaching. This welcome reprint, with its numerous quotations, should remind the modern scholar of Campbell's power as a speaker. McLean wrote as an admirer, not as a rhetorical critic. Yet he does pack much valuable information into a few pages.

CARROLL ELLIS,
David Lipscomb College

NINE GREAT PLAYS: FROM AESCHYLUS TO ELIOT. Edited by Leonard F. Dean (Revised). New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1955; pp. 695. $2.50.

A popular drama anthology has undergone major revision, with substitution of three new plays and a new translation. Certainly editor Leonard Dean's choices could scarcely have been happier ones.

Oedipus Rex now appears in the Fitts-Fitzgerald translation, replacing Yeats' version, which condenses the chorus speeches. Morris Bishop's vigorous and funny translation of *Le Malade imaginaire* is substituted for *Le Misanthrope* of the earlier edition. Archer's translation of *An Enemy to the People* now replaces *The Wild Duck*, because, as Professor Dean puts it, "many teachers find the former play particularly timely." O'Neill's *The Emperor Jones* will be missed, for it has been dropped in favor of a Bernard Shaw comedy (now available for anthology publication), *Pygmalion*. Louis MacNeice's rendering of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*, Jonson's *Volpone*, Congreve's *The Way of the World*, Chekhov's *The Cherry Orchard*, and Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral* round out the anthology, as in the first edition.

The publisher's decision to distribute the revised *Nine Great Plays* in flexible binding places its purchase price easily within the range of any student's pocketbook. Dean's excellent collection should receive enthusiastic classroom endorsement.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.,
Colorado School of Mines

NOTEBOOK FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Ray Ehrensberger and Elaine Pagel. (Second edition). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956; pp. xii+162.

The reaction to this revision of the notebook will depend almost entirely upon the outlook of the potential user. For those who do not use such devices, this will, of course, have no particular appeal; but for those speech instructors who have found that the use of a printed notebook for the student serves as a valuable aid, this book will undoubtedly prove extremely helpful.

The authors have presented, in compact form, a book which gives the student a basic outline to structure and direct his learning, a place to take and keep in logical arrangement his notes, and a means for recording the instructor's comments and criticisms as a guide for his growth.

This is not a textbook in the usual sense of the word. It presents only the barest of outlines of public speaking. Rather, it is "keyed" to nine standard college texts and suggests specific readings in these for each of the thirty-one assignments given. In addition, the notebook provides space for the student's notes, both in relation to specific "project questions" and from class discussion. And, finally, space is provided for the outline of each speech, the instructor's criticisms, and also for outside listening reports.

Generally, the authors have, within the scope of their aim, developed a thorough and useful publication. Particularly in the use of questions to direct the student's thinking, they seem to have divised a valuable and thought-provoking method.

Of course, one might question the wisdom of certain facets of the work, such as the use of a four-step evaluation scale when most colleges use a five-step system, the amount of space allotted for note-taking (rather limited, especially for students with "generous hands"), and certain elements of the over-all organization (dividing the course into "two semesters" with the first devoted to delivery, the second to organization, the authors have inexplicably presented an early, and somewhat inadequate, discussion of outlining). However, in general, the notebook is well thought out and sufficiently inclusive to allow for considerable variation in use and in the ideas of the instructor. It will undoubtedly prove a valuable aid to many beginning speech classes.

DALE D. DRUM,
The Pennsylvania State University

TELEVISION TECHNIQUES. By Hoyland Bettinger. Revised by Sol Cornberg. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1955; pp. x+236. $3.75.

The late Hoyland Bettinger, in his book, *Television Techniques*, recently "updated" by Sol Cornberg, comes close to an answer to the difficult question, *What is "showmanship?"*

". . . it becomes clear that a crying need exists for a realization that the basic factors of television showmanship are not new," Mr. Bettinger stated in the Preface to his first edition (1947), "but are as old as the arts from which they are derived. Furthermore, that a thorough schooling in these derivative forms is as essential to good program production as the electrons themselves. It is toward this end that my efforts have been directed, for it seems to me that, in order to do good work in any medium, one must be familiar with the basic principles that govern it and with the methods and techniques employed by masters and expert craftsmen, past and present, in achieving noteworthy results."

Mr. Bettinger, a nationally-known television consultant and widely associated with theater and films, died in 1950. Sol Cornberg, Director of Studio and Plant Planning (TV) for the National Broadcasting Company, has made a revision of the text bringing it up to date with the developments in equipment and techniques, including the special problems of color television.

The book is written solely on the techniques of production. It does not attempt to give a history of television, the business side of the industry, or a commentary on the social impact of the new living room "monster." It is a specialized study, to the advantage of the reader. It is a completely usable and valuable book for the student or worker in television production who wishes a fundamental understanding of the reason why good programs are good and a listing and explanation of time-proven principles which act to insure the building of good programs.

The ten chapter titles of the book—Tools of the Trade, The Medium, Pictorial Composition and Continuity, Video Techniques, Audio Techniques, Television Writing, Directing and Producing, Producing the Play, Motion Pictures and Film Integration, Television Lighting—do not give an adequate insight to the content of the book. It is not until the reader explores the pages that he discovers that here is an unusually introspective

analysis, and a thorough description of principles.

This is not an easy book for the beginner, though it seems to this reviewer a valuable handbook for any person being thrust into any form of television production. It is easily readable. Mr. Bettinger warned that "For the uninitiated and novices in the use of the medium, it will have to be read and re-read in order to be absorbed. Even then, the principles and techniques enumerated will amount to little more than an enumeration unless they are brought to life by actual use, so that they become a part of one's working equipment."

Although the book does not seem to follow at all times the principles of unity and continuity stressed in its pages, and although certain few and relatively unimportant descriptions and references seem to want for clearer explanation, this reviewer finds the weaknesses of the book of small concern when compared to its values. The book should be of real value to all who make use of the medium.

GARRETT L. STARMER,
Chico State College

WRITING FOR TELEVISION. By Eric Heath. (Third edition). New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1953; pp. xx+438. $6.95.

This book, originally copyrighted in 1950, is now in its third edition. It is intended as a complete home course in television writing with aids outlined for plot development, and even a list of locales for the writer's story.

The author urges the budding playwright to start writing for the television market, because it is the greatest consumer of material, even though he hold the legitimate stage to be the "King of Entertainment." For the reason that much of television is filmed, the book deals with both live television and films.

Initial chapters deal with the scope of television, program types, and the elements of production. Most of the chapters have good summary endings to help clarify the points made in the chapter proper.

Heath urges the student to study earnestly the characters in his play so that he will know their habits and peculiarities, claiming that characterization will be revealed by the purposes of the characters and personality by mannerisms. The video should be emphasized over the audio, as the audience would rather see the characters do something than hear them talk about it. The use of sound and music in the television script is dealt with in Chapter Six. Sound and music are claimed to add realism and mood to the play; and also, it is cheaper to use a sound effect record of an audience clapping than it is to produce the audience.

According to Heath "there is definitely a basic formula for television play writing." Holding to this idea, the longest chapter in the book is titled "Story Creation" and includes his master formula. The writing aids included are Eighteen Basic Human Motives, 102 Dramatic Themes, Male and Female Types, and a list of Locales or Environments.

To some this method of teaching might seem rather mechanistic, but the author maintains that the success of the playwright will depend upon how well he can embellish the basic plot with character delineation, dialogue, and authentic locales.

A short story, "The Execution," is adapted for television with explanatory notes telling why this story was selected and how the adaptation was made.

Concluding chapters deal with writing for television film, comedy, juvenile programs, and a miscellaneous chapter that includes audience participation programs and other types of shows. The final section of the book appropriately tells how to market the script that has now been brought forth after following the directions in the book.

HAROLD E. NELSON,
Pennsylvania State University

THE CARLETON DRAMA REVIEW. Edited by Robert W. Corrigan. Northfield, Minnesota: The Carleton Players, Carleton College, 1956; pp. 71. $.75.

"In the belief that there is a need for a journal devoted solely to the publication of articles on dramatic criticism—both as a source for new researches in dramatic literature and as an outlet of publication for those people working in the field of the dramatic arts—it is our plan to publish *The Carleton Drama Review* three times a year in October, January, and May. The subscription rate will be two dollars for the three issues." Subscriptions and manuscripts should be sent to the editor.

The initial issue is devoted to Greek Tragedy and contains articles by George Boas, Eugene H. Falk, Leon Reisman, and Robert Corrigan.

BOOKS RECEIVED

U. S. POLICY IN ASIA. Edited by William W. Wade. The Reference Shelf. Volume 27, Number 6. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1955; pp. 184. $2.00.

IMMIGRATION AND THE UNITED STATES. Edited by Poyntz Tyler. The Reference Shelf. Volume 28, Number 1. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1956; pp. 201. $2.00.

AMBROSE BIERCE AND THE BLACK HILLS. By Paul Fatout. Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1956; pp. xi+180. $3.50.

THE SHOCK OF RECOGNITION. Edited by Edmund Wilson. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Cudahy, Inc., 1955. pp. xvii+1290. $6.50.

CURRENT BIOGRAPHY YEARBOOK, 1955. Edited by Marjorie Dent Candee. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1956; pp. 706. $6.00.

DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN MAXIMS. Compiled by David Kin. New York: Philosophical Library, 1955; pp. 597. $7.50.

THE LANGUAGE ARTS, THE CHILD, AND THE TEACHER. By Zelma W. Baker. San Francisco: Fearon Publishers, 1955; pp. xvi+264. $4.50.

OUR LANGUAGE: THE STORY OF THE WORDS WE USE. By Eloise Lambert. New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shephard Company, 1955; pp. xi+181. $3.00.

SPEECH WAYS. By Louise Binder Scott and J. J. Thompson. St. Louis: Webster Publishing Company, 1955; pp. viii+216.

SPEAK EXPERTLY IN FOUR WEEKS. By I. J. Baicker. New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1955; pp. 160. $3.00.

RADIO PLAYS OF FAMOUS STORIES. By Lewy Olfson. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1956; pp. 250. $3.75.

ETHEL AND ALBERT COMEDIES. By Peg Lynch. New York: Samuel French, Inc., 1956; pp. 60. $1.25.

MYSTERY PLAYS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE. By John Murray. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1956; pp. 372. $4.00.

1955 ANTHOLOGY OF BEST ORIGINAL SHORT-SHORTS. Edited by Robert Oberfirst. Ocean City, New Jersey: Oberfirst Publications, 1956; pp. 232. $3.95.

HANDBOOK FOR THEME ANALYSIS. By Paul L. Dressel and Lewis B. Mayhew. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown and Company; pp. v+78. $1.50.

CHRISTIANITY AND ANTI-SEMITISM. By Nicolas Berdyaev. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1954; pp. 58. $2.75.

DICTIONARY OF LAST WORDS. By Edward S. LeComte. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1954; pp. xxix+267. $5.00.

A COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS. By Alistair Cooke. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1954; pp. 30. $1.00.

THE CREATIVE ENCOUNTER: AN INTERPRETATION OF RELIGION AND THE SOCIAL WITNESS. By Howard Thurman. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954; pp. 153. $2.00.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF SIR PATRICK HASTINGS. By Sir Patrick Hastings. New York: Roy Publishers, 1954; pp. 302. $4.50.

THE WRITER AND PSYCHOANALYSIS. By Edmund Bergler. New York: Robert Brunner, 1954; pp. 314. $3.75.

HAWTHORNE'S DOCTOR GRIMSHAWE'S SECRET. Edited by Edward H. Davidson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954; pp. vii+305. $5.00.

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

EIGHTEEN INTEREST GROUPS have now been organized and are functioning as a part of the Speech Association of America.

They are: Administrative Policies and Practices, American Forensic Association, Business and Professional Speaking, Discussion and Group Methods, General Semantics and Related Methodologies, High School Discussion and Debate, History of Speech Education, Interpretation, Parliamentary Procedure, Personal and Social Psychology of Speech, Radio, TV, and Cinema, Rhetoric and Public Address, Speech and Hearing Disorders, Speech for Religious Workers, Speech in the Elementary School, Speech in the Secondary School, Undergraduate Speech Instruction, Voice, Linguistics, and Phonetics.

Shop Talk calls these to your attention because you will find them very much in evidence at the Chicago convention.

As you turn through the convention program, you will see that nearly all of the section meetings are sponsored by some Interest Group.

You will find, moreover, that each Interest Group has scheduled two "business" or "planning" meetings at which matters of special concern to the group will be discussed.

THE IDEA IS to decentralize the administration, the policy-making, and the program planning of the Speech Association of America.

Suppose your interest is X. Looking through the list, you will probably find an X interest group. You should plan to attend the open meetings and section programs of X. You will probably find that everybody who is anybody in X will be there. You will have a better opportunity than ever before to get to know the people you have heard about. You will have a chance to make your own presence felt. All in all, you ought to run into a good many ideas about X.

Some of you may find not only X, but X' and X". You may therefore locate not only one Interest Group, but two or three. So you will have a chance to explore not only your central interest, but some of your fringe concerns.

SHOP TALK would like to encourage those who attend the Chicago convention to plan to be on hand Wednesday, December 26, which in 1956 is the day usually and traditionally labeled the "pre-convention day."

Many years ago the preconvention day was honored by only a handful of Executive Council members and committee workers. The last few years, however, have seen an increasing number of people show up early. Perhaps a fourth of the convention goers at Los Angeles were in the hotel on the pre-convention day.

That statistic stands out in sharp contrast to the situation at the typical convention five years ago, when 80% of the total registration would be accomplished between 9 a.m. and 11 a.m. of the first regular convention day. You may recall the long lines.

Apparently nowadays goers want to spend more time at the convention—so they will have more opportunity to meet friends, see the city, attend plays, and the like.

An additional reason for being in Chicago on December 26 is that all of the Interest Groups, and the new Legislative Assembly, will have their opening meetings on that day. It will really be a historic occasion. And if you arrive on December 26, you will be on hand early the next morning for the big Convention Breakfast with which the program formally opens. You will hear more about the Convention Breakfast next fall.

READERS WILL ASK, "But why the pre-convention day on December 26, the day after Christmas? Why not schedule the pre-convention day on December 28, with the convention proper on December 29, 30, and 31?"

December 31 runs into complications at the convention hotel, which always has New Year's Eve parties scheduled. The staff needs to start decorating the big ball rooms early in the day. On years when SAA has met on December 31 it has invariably had to give up some of the big meeting rooms. Now that convention attendance is double and triple what it once was, SAA and the other associations try to avoid this date whenever they can.

December 30 falls on Sunday this year, and on at least two occasions in the past ten years the Executive Council has voted not to meet on Sunday. This decision was reached after consultation with members who are on the faculties of church-related institutions. Of course the point is a debatable one, and the new Legislative Assembly and Administrative Council may want to review the whole policy. Interestingly enough, our friends in AETA have decided to make their principal convention dates December 28, 29, and 30; so, although both groups are meeting at the Conrad Hilton, AETA members will begin and close their meetings one day later than SAA and other cooperating associations.

SHOP TALK therefore renews its invitation to convention goers to plan to be in Chicago on December 26 for the opening Interest Group and Legislative Assembly meetings. This procedure will cause some anguish on Christmas day, but 1956 is one of those years when the calendar gives us a bad break. To spread the unhappiness, Shop Talk points out that the members of SAA's Committee on Committees, composed of past and present officers, will need to gather at the convention hotel on the evening of Christmas day itself. So if any one has in his heart a kindly and charitable feeling toward any SAA officer, and wants to send him a Christmas greeting, the proper address would appear to be in care of the Conrad Hilton, Chicago, Illinois. The editor of Shop Talk, now your first vice-president, will as usual house himself in the boiler room, next to Food Service and Table Linens.

EACH ISSUE of Shop Talk includes the schedules of a good many college and university theatres. To see which titles are the most popular, we made a tabulation of those listed in the last six numbers.

At the top of the Shop Talk Hit Parade is *My Three Angels*, produced by eight college or university theatres. Next are *Pygmalion* and *Night Must Fall*, each appearing on the bills of six theatres. In third place are *Amphitryon 38*, *Antigone*, *Mister Roberts*, and *Othello*, with five. In fourth place are *The Crucible*, *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Hamlet*, *Sabrina Fair*, *The Taming of the Shrew*, *A Streetcar Named Desire*, *Dial "M" for Murder*, and *Mrs. McThing*, all with four listings each.

The following have been chosen by three theatres: *Measure for Measure*, *Twelfth Night*, *Elizabeth the Queen*, *The Fifth Season*, *The Moon is Blue*, *Macbeth*, *The Lady's Not for Burning*, *Picnic*, *A Phoenix Too Frequent*, *The Cain Mutiny Court Martial*, *Ring Around the Moon*, *Bell, Book and Candle*, *Amahl and the Night Visitors*, *Dark of the Moon*.

Shop Talk does not have the space to include detailed information about each play, but we will list the schedule of your theatre if you will take the trouble to mail it to us.

THE FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, who has the grave and solemn responsibility of assembling convention program copy from the eighteen Interest Group vice-chairmen, from many SAA committee chairmen, and eventually from vice-presidents of other associations, has, after consultation with all the authorities, set May 15 as the date when program copy should be in. It is a date that has grown up after years of experience, and stems from the fact that programs are hard to develop after school is out and people scatter far and wide; and from the further fact that on October 1, suddenly after the opening of the new academic year, copy for a 96 to 128 page convention program has to show up at the printer's.

Right now a hundred and fifty section chairmen and sponsors are in the middle of

their plans. They have written countless letters in search of proper and appropriate section themes, and of competent and generally effective people to develop these topics. Ideas have been exchanged and refined. At times group sponsorships have evolved, and are still evolving. Once an individual agrees to present a paper, he needs to formulate an exact title for it. So it goes.

SAA's first vice-president hopes that by May 15 all of these major and minor decisions will have been made, and that a stream of data will begin to flow to his desk by way of the program sponsors. He hopes these data are complete in every particular, even to the spelling of names and wording of titles. However, others who have undertaken this assignment have told him that sooner or later he will have a dream, an occupational nightmare, in which much program copy shows up, days late, like this:

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29
10:35 a.m. to 12:00 m.
Cauliflower Room

Problems of the Curriculum (exact title still to be determined)
Sponsor: GEORGE BACKLASH (X Interest Group)
Chairman: . . . SMITH, *University of Shangri-La*
Participants:

HARRY HURRAH, *College of the Aztecs*
(title to be forwarded in a few days)
Several other well-known authorities, to be announced later

HARPER AND BROTHERS has signed a contract for publishing the next volume of studies in American public address sponsored by the Speech Association of America. This volume, dealing with public address on the issues of anti-slavery and disunion, 1858-1861, is being prepared by a group of 27 contributors, under the editorial direction of J. Jeffery Auer, A. Craig Baird, and Henry Lee Ewbank.

This exciting news gives Shop Talk a chance to say again what a happy arrangement it is to have great publishing houses like Harper, McGraw-Hill, Longmans, Green, and Appleton-Century-Crofts collaborate with SAA scholars in producing volumes of studies that are fundamental and basic. Titles like *History and Criticism of American Public Address* and *History of Speech Education in America* are an ornament to any publisher's list; and the contributors are no doubt equally pleased to have their product given the careful attention for which these houses are well known.

Committees are now at work on other volumes of studies, and we hope they are able to make a similar arrangement for the publication of their papers.

FROM THE PUBLICATION *LSU Outlook*, in an issue devoted to graduate study at Louisiana State University, Shop Talk notes a tabulation of master's and doctor's degrees awarded by the various departments of that institution. In the list of master's degrees, the Department of Speech appears as having awarded 190, sixth among the departments offering that degree. The article goes on to say that 11 LSU departments have granted at least ten Ph.D. degrees: in that list chemistry is first with 70 and Speech second with 52.

SPEECH AND THE CEREBRAL CORTEX was the general title of the three Vanuxem Lectures delivered at Princeton University on February 13, 14, and 16, by Dr. Wilder Penfield, director of the Montreal Neurological Institute. An audience filling one of the largest lecture rooms on the Princeton Campus heard Dr. Penfield on these three dates discuss what he as a brain surgeon has found to be true of the relation between speech areas in the human brain and speech functions of the human indiyidual. In his first lecture Dr. Penfield discussed the functional organization of the brain and its relation to mind. "Aphasia—Some Evidence from Cortical Stimulation and Excision" was the topic of his second lecture, and he concluded the series with a discourse entitled "Speech and the Learning of Language." The lectures will be published later this year under the joint authorship of Dr. Penfield and Dr. Lee Roberts, the latter of whom has interpreted Dr. Penfield's findings in relation to what was previously known in their field. This publication, and Dr. Penfield's original lectures, are an important addition to our understanding of man's capacity to speak. The Vanuxem Lectures are devoted each year to subjects predominantly scientific in character, and previous lecturers on this foundation include James Bryant Conant, Julian Huxley, and J. Robert Oppenheimer.

THE NEW YORK TIMES *Book Review* for Sunday, February 12, calls attention to recent works of two present members of the editorial staff of the *QJS*, E. J. West and Robert D. Clark. West's edition of Bernard Shaw's letters to Reginald Golding Bright (*Advice to a Young Critic* by Bernard Shaw, ed. E. J. West, New York: Crown Publishers, 1956) is reviewed in

that issue by Brooks Atkinson, who speaks of West as "a true Shavian" and of his notes as full of collateral information "that puts everything into perspective." Four pages farther on, the same issue advertises Dean Clark's *The Life of Matthew Simpson* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956), calling it "the story of an exciting, varied and influential career."

SPRING HOUSECLEANING note: A colleague who offices down the hall from us recently undertook a spot of housecleaning and turned up all sorts of valuable possessions, including fifty unbound copies of *The Rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton,* long believed to be out of print. As this distinguished colleague has never been known as a clean-desk man, we were not surprised, and would not have been even if he had exhumed fifty new copies of Thomas Wilson's *The Arte of Rhetorique* (1553). Actually we have been beyond surprise ever since interviewing a London scholar whose study had been previously described to us as a compost heap. Oddly enough it *was* a compost heap, filled with notes and papers going back at least a thousand years, and with stained teacups and fragments of sandwiches going back at least a hundred. When *that* mound is sectioned by the experts we suspect it may contain mint copies of Longinus, *On the Sublime,* with critical notes and a biography of the author.

THE PROBLEM CHOSEN for the national high school forensic series for 1956-57 has been announced as follows: *What agricultural policy will best serve the interests of the people of the United States?* The problem comprehends three propositions for debate and three questions for discussion.

Discussion Questions. 1. *What should be the policy of the federal government in regard to price supports?* 2. *What should be the role of government in the conservation of soil resources?* 3. *What should be the policy of the federal government in regard to agricultural surpluses?*

Debate Propositions. 1. Resolved: *That the federal government should adopt the basic principles of the Brannan Plan.* 2. Resolved: *That the federal government should sustain the prices of major agricultural products at not less than 90 per cent of parity.* 3. Resolved: *That the federal government should remove from use sufficient acreage to balance agricultural production.*

In addition to the foregoing, other propositions or questions may be announced from time to time at the option of any of the cooperating leagues. At the annual conference sponsored by the Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials meeting at the Conrad Hilton in Chicago on December 27 and 28, representatives of the leagues will choose a single debate proposition and a single discussion question for the remainder of the academic year.

THE PROGRAM of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Louisiana College Conference held at McNeese State College in Lake Charles on March 2 included addresses by Albert L. Capauder, professor of Speech and director of radio and television broadcasting at Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and James H. Miller, consultant in theatre design and associate professor at Centenary College.

Edna West of Northwestern State College served as program chairman. Lucille Magnon of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, chairman of the Speech Section, presided over the business session which followed. The following officers were elected to serve in 1956-57: Margery Wilson, McNeese State College, chairman; Lynn F. Kluth, Southeastern Louisiana College, vice-chairman; Owen Peterson, Louisiana State University, secretary; and Roy D. Murphy, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, program chairman.

PROWLING THROUGH THE STACKS in the University of Missouri library, we were surprised to see, nestled among the 808.5's, practically a whole shelf of bound volumes of *The Southern Speech Journal.* Only yesterday, it seems, we looked at Volume 1, Number 1, just off the press; and here it is in its twenty-first year. *SSJ* therefore has not only had the longest career among the regional journals, but perhaps one of the most distinguished; it has long had a tradition of good scholarship and editing. The annual grant from the University of Florida has certainly been put to good use. Typographically, too, *SSJ* deserves a ribbon; the format is in the best tradition of academic journals; the styling is neat, clean-cut, and of a piece. In some journals, as every reader knows, headings scream and shout, whereas the author's message is reflective and restrained (obviously we are now at the moment thinking about journals in other fields, language, maybe, or psychology); or the body type seems more suitable to agricultural implements than to scholarly meditation. Members of the Southern Speech Association will soon need to make plans for their silver an-

niversary volume, which will be upon them before they realize it.

UNDER THE HEADING of "Louder, Please, Professor," the February issue of *Antioch Notes* has some thoughtful and provocative comments about the salaries of college professors.

"Louder, Please, Professor" points out that the requirements of a college professor's family are indistinguishable from those of the doctor, the lawyer, or the business executive of comparable age and stature. The problem is, the article continues, that this standard of living carries a current price tag of from ten to eighteen thousand dollars a year, ~~and~~ the college teacher gets half these amounts.

"The answer is not to be found in some impressive percentage increase from a base that never made sense in terms of his comparative place in the social-economic structure. The solution must lie in an entirely new pay scale. . . . So long as the college teacher regards a $220 raise as a welcome supplement to his $5,500 salary, the 'plight' will be with us. But if he considers it as only a small move along the road from $5,500 to an expected salary of $11,000, then he may be on his way towards an economic position that will bring him dignity and peace of mind."

"Louder, Please, Professor" comments that the answer is not to put a fringe on top of the salary—a fringe in the form of cooperative purchasing, reduced taxes, and subsidized insurance—but to work to increase the salary under the fringe—"the salary with the dough on the bottom."

Under the subtitle of "Salaries First" the author suggests what teachers could do to help themselves:

1. When industry offers scholarships to deserving students, teachers might point out that their low salaries have subsidized students for years, and that scholarship grants might be more suitably directed towards restoring the teacher's pay.

2. When foundations pump large sums into new programs and research, teachers might suggest that so long as existing programs can be financed only through below-minimum salaries, expansions of this nature might be held down.

3. When subsidies and fringe benefits are proposed for some, teachers might discuss the value of direct increases for all.

4. When new buildings are planned, teachers might review the plans being made toward the goal of an adequate salary.

Once there was a day when physicians were underpaid. Adequate compensation to physicians apparently has not lowered the quality of medical care. "I am sure," the article concludes, "that the quality of American education will be far better when it is staffed by adequately compensated teachers."

The bulletin appears over the signature of Morton A. Rauh, business manager of Antioch. No academician has stated the case so well. Louder, please, professor!

NEWS FROM SAA'S PRESIDENT: Wayne Thompson, of the University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, has been named to the Clerkship of the Legislative Assembly. . . . The following have agreed to serve on the committee to nominate the Editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the term 1958-1960: Dallas Dickey, chairman, University of Florida; Gladys Borchers, University of Wisconsin; Donald Hargis, University of California at Los Angeles; Wanda Mitchell, Evanston Township High School; Henry Mueller, University of Illinois.

THE WINTER MEETING of the New Hampshire Speech Association was held January 14 at the University of New Hampshire. Edward D. Shanken of the University of New Hampshire was re-elected president. Other officers of the New Hampshire Speech Association are: Marion Zeller, Goffstown, vice-president; Ruth Estes, Laconia, secretary; Elizabeth J. Donovan, Concord, treasurer. President Shanken appointed the following committee chairmen: Richard O. Blanchard, Concord, drama; T. C. Abbey, Holderness, debate; and Ruth Estes, Laconia, speech events.

The Association's next meeting will be May 12 at Goffstown High School.

VOLUMES OF *The Speech Teacher* are already a collector's item. The demand by libraries for sets of this publication, says Executive Secretary Waldo Braden, has exhausted the supply of certain issues. If you have numbers 2 and 3 of volume 1, or 3 and 4 of volume 4, and will part with them at $1.00 each, you will make it possible for some college or university library to have a complete set.

The Executive Secretary is also always in the market for sets or parts of sets of this *Journal*. He recently secured about twenty bound volumes from a member of the Association, and within twenty-four hours had the set on its way to the University of Puerto Rico.

That transaction was a good one for both parties.

Executive Secretary Kenneth Graham of the American Educational Theatre Association now says it is difficult to locate a complete set of the seven volumes of the AETA *Journal*. One of the issues in short supply is the March, 1954, number. As that issue carried a directory of colleges and universities offering work in children's theatre, it was soon in demand. AETA would be glad to buy a few copies back at 75c per issue. You will not get rich on the deal, but you will make it possible for a library to have a complete set.

THE COMMITTEE on Intercollegiate Debate and Discussion extends its annual invitation to directors of forensic activities in all colleges and universities to participate in the selection of the 1956-1957 debate proposition and discussion question. Although the committee is attempting to canvass all directors, if you do not receive a direct request by mid-May, you are urged to send your suggestions for topics to one of the following Committee members before June 1: Winston Brembeck, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Glenn L. Jones, 1171 Garrison, Denver 15; T. Earle Johnson, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; Glen E. Mills, Northwestern University, Evanston; Larry Norton, Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois; Austin J. Freeley, chairman, Boston University, Boston 15.

THE FOLLOWING is from a memorial, written for the College of Literature, Science, and the Arts, University of Michigan, by William P. Halstead, Kenneth T. Rowe, and G. E. Densmore.

Valentine Windt died in Ann Arbor on January 17, 1956. In his death the University community lost a man who for twenty-eight years contributed brilliantly and with devotion to the creation of theatre. He was born in Budapest, Hungary, in 1901. He came with his parents to the United States in 1903, attended New York public schools, and through the naturalization of his father became a citizen in 1914. In 1921 he was graduated from Cornell University with a Bachelor of Arts degree with honors in English Literature, and took his Master of Arts degree at Princeton University in 1922. He took graduate work in theatre at the Drama School of Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, and studied at the American Laboratory Theatre in New York under Boleslavsky and at the University of Iowa. Prior to joining the University of Michigan he had been an Instructor in English at the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

In 1928 Windt came to the University of Michigan as an Instructor in Speech and the Director of Play Production for the Department of Speech. . . . In his first years at the University he initiated the expansion of the program and set the standards of excellence of production by which the teaching of theatre arts at the University of Michigan has become established in a position of distinction.

As a director Windt was distinguished by catholicity of taste and acuteness of perception for all types and periods of dramatic literature. He was motivated by standards rather than theories (and his standards were of an admirable simplicity and difficulty), by artistic integrity to the truth of each work of dramatic literature, and professional finish in every production, with the maximum development of the creativity which lay in the students. He taught primarily by the active process of production and with an inspirational devotion to what is best in theatre. Many of his students have attained distinction as actors, directors, and teachers. One of his effective accomplishments was his part in the coordination of the Department of Speech, the School of Music, and the Dance Program of the Department of Physical Education for Women in pioneering work in the production of operas in the educational theatre; he has directed two or more operas a year for twenty years.

Windt worked with equal facility as director of professional actors in the University of Michigan Drama Season, 1940-1942, and 1949-1955. In this annual five-week season, he maintained an educational training function by giving a number of students each year the experience of acting with representative and foremost actors of the professional theatre, such as, for the 1955 season, Helen Hayes and Eva LaGallienne.

Windt's accomplishment as a director of educational theatre was widely recognized outside the University and he took an active part in national professional organizations. He was present at the organizational meeting of the American Educational Theatre Association in St. Louis in December, 1936, served as Acting President during most of 1945 and as President in 1946. He was one of the initially invited membership of the National Theatre Conference, and a member of the American National Theatre and Academy, the Speech Association of America, and Actors' Equity Association.

For the Speech Department, the Drama Season, and community groups, Windt personally directed 241 plays in Ann Arbor. His last production was a student-written play which opened December 8. His wide range of theatre included the first efforts of the young playwright as well as the monumental works in drama and opera; the beginning actor's initial attempts as well as the finest professional performances. His final illness was mercifully short, and in the preceding weeks he was particularly happy in the subject, associations, and accomplishment of his last production. He grew throughout the years of his activity in imaginative insight and discipline of his art and died at the height of his creative energy and capacity as a teacher. His death is a deeply felt loss to educational and professional theatre, and to his students, colleagues, and friends.

MANY A TEACHER of speech had a secret accomplishment: he could recite the pronouncing alphabet from *Able* to *Zebra*. This achievement revealed itself in odd places, like departmental parties, but it was nonetheless solid and genuine. *Able, Baker, Charlie, Dog, Easy, Fox*, and so on, the alphabet went. Even people who never wore a uniform had heard of *Roger*.

Now the armed forces have become international, and the need suddenly arose for a NATO pronouncing alphabet. *Able, Baker, Charlie*, spoken by a Frenchman, sounded like something from the menu. So many of the words have been changed, and now the list reads *Alfa, Bravo, Charlie, Delta, Echo, Foxtrot*, and on to *Zulu*. R-*Roger* is now R-*Romeo*. We thought the readers of the *QJS* (now *Quebec-Juliett-Sierra*) ought to know about all this. Our scouts report, however, that the NATO Frenchman will have as much trouble with *Charlie* as ever.

MICHIGAN'S FIRST EDUCATIONAL television station, WKAR-TV of Michigan State University, reached its second anniversary on Jan. 15. During its first two years of operation WKAR-TV has presented a daily program schedule ranging from telecourses (college courses for actual credit) to sports and entertainment.

Four major purposes of the university station have continued to be: the presentation and interpretation of the university's work in instruction, research, and public service; development of educational programs for use by other stations and public service organizations; the broadcast of informational, cultural, and entertainment programs; and the development of a training program and courses of study for M.S.U. staff and students.

THE MUSIC CORPORATION of America has established a new fellowship for playwriting students at the Yale School of Drama. The new $1,000 MCA Fellowship, announced today by F. Curtis Canfield, Dean of the Yale Drama School, is the third for student playwrights now offered at Yale, The Radio Corporation of America and The William Morris Agency also offering these scholarships.

RICHARD C. REAGER, professor of speech at Rutgers University, died on February 16 of a heart attack at his home. He was 60 years old.

Professor Reager began teaching at Rutgers in 1924. In 1950 his book, *You Can Talk Well*, published by the University Press, was the selection of the Executives' Book of the Month Club.

Born in Norwalk, Ohio, Professor Reager had a varied career. He attended the University of Pittsburgh but left to fight in France during World War I.

He was assistant pastor and lecturer at a Methodist church in Chicago from 1920 to 1922, managed a Chicago hotel in 1922-23 and headed the Department of Speech and Dramatics at Hastings (Neb.) College before joining the Rutgers faculty.

In 1923, Professor Reager took a Bachelor of Letters degree from Northwestern University and a Master of Arts degree from New York University in 1927. He was a past president of the Speech Association of New Jersey.

THE FACULTY of Southern Illinois University presented a musical comedy, *Mike Kado, Ph.D.*, November 16 and 17. The show was a satire on the red tape of University life. The plot centers around the problems of Mike Kado, who is appointed Dean of a new School of Birdwatching and tries to requisition a box of bird seed. Most of the common problems of University life such as housing, parking space, requisition forms, students, and the complications caused by administrators are dealt with in a facetious manner in this show. The play was well received and played to packed houses both nights. Paul Hunsinger, is the author of this musical comedy and would be glad to send the script to anyone interested.

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Speech Association of America, American Forensic Association, National Society for the Study of Communication, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29, 1956. Some committee, council, and assembly meetings on December 26. American Educational Theatre Association, same place, December 28-30. Some committee, council, and project group meetings on December 27.

Other conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheduled as follows:

1957: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28.
1958: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.
1959: Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.
1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.
1961: Hotel Statler, New York, December.
1962: Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, December.

ON THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON campus over the week end of February 9, 10, and 11 was held the annual Northwest Drama Conference with representatives from nearly every Western state, including Montana and Colorado. De Marcus Brown, head of the Drama Department at the College of Pacific, spoke on "The College Drama Curriculum." Joseph Fitch of Montana State College spoke on "The Theatre as Curriculum and as a Vocation." E. J. West, of the University of Colorado, spoke on "The Plays of Bernard Shaw in the College Theatre."

Three plays were presented for all conference delegates: *Macbeth* in the University's Main Theatre, *Fancy Meeting You Again* by Kaufman and McGrath in the Arena Theatre, and *Reclining Figure* in Eugene's Very Little Theatre.

FOR THE NINTH consecutive year the fall Intercollegiate Speech Tournament was held on the Bradley campus, November 18 and 19, with more than 500 entrants from approximately 49 colleges and universities in the mid-west. Sponsored by Pi Kappa Delta, the Bradley tournament has become the largest invitational meet in the country.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA'S Department of Telecommunications, one of 23 colleges and universities applying, received a grant of $5,000, awarded by the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, Michigan, to produce a series to be titled, "Growth of America." The production staff includes Stuart Cooney, producer; Ed DeRoo, director; and Donel Price, writer-researcher.

THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH at Wisconsin sends a newsletter from time to time to its friends and alumni, and Shop Talk was especially impressed by the 1955 edition, issued just before the Christmas holidays. It consisted of some twenty mimeographed pages of departmental and personal notes, edited with just the proper lack of restraint, and stapled to a yellow cover. We were tempted to lift about half of it for Shop Talk, but in this issue we are being tightly squeezed by New Books on the West and the ad section on the East, and had to hold off. All congratulations, however, to F. W. Haberman and his staff on their annual report.

THE NEWS STAFF of WKBN, Youngstown, on which three Ohio University graduates work, has been awarded the "Distinguished Achievement Award for Outstanding Overall News Operation." This award, which WKBN has won twice in four years, was presented by the International Radio, Television, News Directors Association. The Ohio University graduates are Sid Davis, Don Allen, and Gene Starn. Gene Starn is head of the news staff, which is composed of a total of six men. The station was in competition with more than 2700 stations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE Extension Service has been directing a well-rounded program in debate, speech, and drama in New Hampshire. With the cooperation of the New Hampshire Speech Association a preliminary tournament was held among all the high school students in the state in the speech events: impromptu and extemporaneous speaking; original oratory; humorous, dramatic, and oratorical interpretation. Finals, for those qualifying in the preliminary tourney, were held at the University, with Edward D. Shanken, assistant director of the Extension Service, directing the tournament.

AMONG THE MANY conferences that have come to Shop Talk's attention are: the Silver Anniversary Rocky Mountain Speech Conference, February 9-11, University of Denver; Northwest Drama Conference, February 9-11, University of Oregon; Alfred State Tech Fourth Annual

Drama Festival, March 7-11; Michigan State University's Eleventh Annual Radio and Television Conference, March 10; Fourteenth Annual Delaware Play Festival, March 20-21.

SPECIAL EVENTS CALENDAR

Apple Blossom Festival of Oral Interpretation, Michigan State University, May 16-19. Poetry, drama, prose, multiple reading, speech, newscast. Faculty presentation of *Under Milk Wood, a Play for Voices.* Workshops on standards and materials for oral interpretation. Information may be secured from Moiree Compere.

Summer Speech Institute, University of Wisconsin, August 3. Four demonstrations: the sequential sampling analyzer, synthetic speech, creative dramatics for children, role-playing. Information may be secured from H. H. Brockhaus.

Annual spring conference of the Western Conference Debate League, Minneapolis, April 19-21.

New England Drama Festival, St. Paul's School, Concord, April 27 and 28. Richard O. Blanchard is director.

Bradley University Sixth Invitational Speech Festival for High Schools, April 28. Events included are radio newscasting, original oratory, extemporaneous speaking, story telling, debate, and discussion.

Illinois Speech Association, 1956 convention, University of Illinois, November 2 and 3. The theme chosen is "The Forward Look in Speech." This state association is beginning its second 25 years as a state organization.

Second Annual Playwriting Contest, sponsored by the National Collegiate Players, University of Arkansas. Prizes of $150 and $75 for new plays written by playwrights residing within the continental U. S. Deadline is October 1. Write the Department of Speech, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, for information.

Sixth Annual Television Workshop, Michigan State University, August 6-24. Courses, seminars, laboratory meetings. Information may be secured from William H. Tomlinson at WKAR-TV, East Lansing.

Second Annual Conference on Reading, Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota, June 18-22. The theme is "Basic Essentials in Reading." Demonstrations, lectures, panel discussions, group discussions. Inquiries may be addressed to Walther G. Prausnitz, Concordia College.

Fifth Annual High School Debate Clinic, Ohio University, 1956 summer session. Analysis and study of national high school debate question for 1956-57. Lorin C. Staats is director of the two-week project.

E. C. MABIE, chairman of the department of speech at the State University of Iowa, died on Thursday, February 9. He had been in the hospital for four days for a physical check-up, and had been pronounced in good condition. He began the second semester with his usual vigor, spending Monday and Tuesday at registration headquarters, and was at his office Wednesday and Thursday dealing with problems of staffing and budgets for the summer and following terms. Thursday, after an afternoon nap, he continued his work into the evening. He then went to bed, but was stricken soon after, and passed away about 8:30.

Ranking high among leaders in the development of the educational theatre in the United States, Professor Mabie was the guiding light in the creation of the American Educational Theatre Association and became its first president in 1936. This development was an outgrowth of activities in the National Association of Teachers of Speech, of which he had served as president 10 years earlier.

One of Mabie's biggest contributions to the educational theatre from a regional point of view was the University Theatre plant at Iowa City. Largely responsible for obtaining a $50,000 construction grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, he was a driving force in its functional design and construction.

Mabie's primary interests in the Iowa curriculum were teaching, research, and play writing on American themes. To this end he was instrumental in securing another Rockefeller Foundation grant, totaling $27,000, which extended over a three-year period from 1934-37 and was used to sponsor apprentice playwrights.

Closely paralleling the story of the educational theatre, Mabie's career at Iowa started in 1920 when he came to the campus as acting head of the department of public speaking. From the beginning his main responsibility and interest lay in developing the area of dramatic art within that department. As a result, for the first time, in 1921, theatrical performances were brought onto the campus from Iowa City houses and all phases of dramatic production were incorporated into the curriculum. By 1926, productions which previously had been sponsored by student societies became the University Theatre as a function of the department. From the outset he worked for academic recognition of

creative work in the dramatic arts department on the same basis as that given for work in any other department.

It was also in the 20's that Mabie started working closely with George Pierce Baker, now recognized as the dean of the educational theatre in the United States, Thomas Wood Stevens and other pioneers of the movement, for a national organization of directors of dramatic art in colleges, universities and community theatres. Under the leadership of these and other national figures, directors throughout the country banded together to form the National Theatre Conference. Mabie served as vice-president from 1931-39, during which time he helped secure a Rockefeller Foundation grant to subsidize the organization.

At the time Mabie started at the State University of Iowa, only one course in dramatic art was offered. Within the first 10 years, 47 master of arts degrees in dramatic art were granted in the speech department, and during the 30 years of Mabie's tenure at Iowa more than 300 such degrees have feen conferred. Twenty-two doctorates have been granted at Iowa. There was also an increase in dramatic productions from four or five a year to 15 more. Since 1920, more than 600 plays have been produced on the Iowa campus.

A memorial scholarship fund, to which friends are invited to contribute, has been organized by the staff of the department at Iowa City. The loss of E. C. Mabie, not only to the department but also to the field of speech as a whole, will be immeasurable.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Brandeis University: *Within the Gates.* Studio programs: *The Forced Marriage, Mourning Becomes Electra, The Man in the Man-Made Moon.*

Bradley University: *Our Town, Thieves' Carnival, The Philadelphia Story, This is Our Challenge.*

Lehigh University: *Henry IV, Part I; The Caine Mutiny Court Martial.*

Ohio University: *Knickerbocker Holiday, Ghosts.* Student Volunteer Movement Ecumenical Conference: *Cry the Beloved Country, A Sleep of Prisoners, Murder in the Cathedral.*

University of Delaware: *The Boor, The Lady of Larkspur Lotion, Mrs. McThing.*

University of Oregon: *Balloon, All My Sons, Carousel.*

University of Wisconsin: *Dial "M" for Murder, The Confidential Clerk, Trial by Jury, Gianni Schicchi, As You Like It, The Fifth Season.* Play Circle: *Bartholomew Fair, Desire Under the Elms.*

University of Michigan: Laboratory playbill: *Ethan Frome, The World We Live In, Blood Wedding* (Act III of these plays); *The Magic Flute.* Premiere: *My Very Own.*

APPOINTMENTS

Illinois State Normal University: Delmar Hansen, dramatic productions, speech classes in the laboratory high school.

Lehigh University: Arthur Prosper, instructor in speech.

Michigan State University: Marvin J. Phillips, technical theatre; Oriel J. Willert, Mary Jane Watkins, children's theatre; Lucy M. Moore, clinic.

Ohio University: Harry Zavos, assistant in public address; James Sullivan, assistant in theatre.

University of Missouri: Sanford Gray, Allene Preston, instructors in speech.

Yale University: Walter Kerr, visiting lecturer in playwriting; John Gassner, Sterling professor of playwriting.

PERSONAL NOTES

Jonathan W. Curvin of the University of Wisconsin has received a faculty research grant to do off-campus research during the second semester of 1956-57 in the field of American theatre and its relation to other arts in the country. . . . William F. Cope is visiting assistant professor of speech in charge of television for the spring semester. He is on sabbatical leave from Oklahoma College for Women. Visiting assistant professor in television for the summer session will be Samuel L. Becker of the University of Iowa. . . . John V. Irwin, director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic, will serve as consultant to the Bell Telephone Company this summer. Replacing him as director of the clinic will be Calvin Pettit, of George Washington University.

Dr. and Mrs. C. M. Wise of Louisiana State University are traveling around the world during the present semester. Their itinerary includes Hawaii, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, Japan, India, Egypt, Palestine, Greece, Italy, and France. They will return to Louisiana State University in time for Dr. Wise to teach in summer school. . . . While he is abroad, Francine Merritt is serving as chair-